



3 3433 07029644 1

(Rogers)

~~466.1~~

7 MY

from Babylon, when the pure Hebrew language was not known to all, care was taken to make the revealed will of God known to all, by translating from the pure Hebrew, into the language more popularly known. Means were employed to enable the people to know the meaning of the Divine record, and to understand the words of eternal life. See Nehem. 8 : 8.

Article 2. It is worth while to inquire the corrupt motive the papal kirk has for being in love with the singularly absurd and cruel custom of speaking only to the outward ear, by using the Latin language, a custom at war with common sense and good feeling. Without pretending to mention all the motives, I will mention five.

1st. To keep the people ignorant, and therefore dependent on the priesthood. "Ignorance is the mother of popery, ay, and the daughter too; ignorance being the mother of popery, both mother and daughter, cause and effect." See section last.

2d. To have a bond of union between the many priests, binding all the members of the priesthood in one huge confederation, in one great alliance, one mighty league, in one body wieldy, tractable, governable; a body separate and apart from the people, alien to the laity in language and interest, and opposite and hostile to popular right, and the spread and dominion of liberty.

3d. To bind the different sees to the see of Rome. Latin being the ancient language of Rome, the adoption of Latin as the general and official language of a kirk marks the kirk with an implicit subjection to the kirk of Rome, making it a part and parcel of the kingdom of the Beast.

4th. To enable the priesthood to be ignorant of living languages.

5th. To cause the Vulgate version of the Bible, the favorite translation of the kirk of Rome, and that is the more authoritative in the eye of the Bible.

reader, and more exclusively entitled to veneration and regard.

Subsection II. If religious improvement and general utility, instead of corruption, carnality, and special interest, were the grand object pursued by the papal kirk or papal court, it would adopt the Greek for its official language, in preference to the Latin. To prove that the Greek deserved to be taken rather than the Latin, I will give six reasons.

Reason first. Greek is the original language of the New Testament, the more important of the two grand divisions of the Bible. Therefore making Greek the general language of the kirk, would tend directly to make the New Testament generally known, and so lead to the diffusion and well-being of Christianity. Real or pure Christianity, however, was not the great end that the papal kirk had in view.

Reason second. Greek gives access to a very good antient version of the Old Testament, the Greek version of the Seventy, called the Septuagint. This is a leading antique version of the Old Testament, both in time and in truth. See Section III, Subsection II, point fourth.

Reason third. Greek literature in general is decidedly superior to the Latin, the intellectual treasure of Greece preponderating that of Rome. Greek philosophy and Greek poetry are superior to their rivals in the old Latin tongue; and in other particulars, the Greek remains are not inferior to the Latin.

Reason fourth. Greek has never ceased or failed to be a living language. 1st. It was the language, more or less, of the Lower, Eastern, Constantinoplan empire. 2d. It has ever been the language of Greece proper. I know that modern Greek differs someddeal from antient; but even if it differ very much, if it differ in particulars very many and very great, it is yet fundamen-

(Rogaw)

~~46~~

7 MY

ANTI-POPERY;

OR POPERY

UNREASONABLE, UNSCRIPTURAL AND NOVEL

BY JOHN ROGERS,

MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,
AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW.

WITH A PREFACE, NOTES, AND INDEX,
BY REV. C. SPARRY, OF NEW-YORK.
A Minister of the Reformed Church.

"Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins,
and that ye receive not of her plagues."—Rev. 18: 4.

Popery is a cunning compound of superficial truth and solid error

SECOND AMERICAN FROM THE LONDON SECOND EDITION,
ENLARGED AND CORRECTED.

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY D. FANSHAW,
No. 150 Nassau-street.

1843.

P



**Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1841, by
DANIEL FANSHAW, in the Clerk's Office of the District
Court of the Southern District of New-York.**

THE INDEX.

Absolution; nature of, design of, to rivet chains of priestly tyranny on the people, 248, 249; papal authors' opinions of this, 250; refutations of this impious tenet and practice, 252, 253.

Anecdote of a little girl, and absolution, 250.

Antichrist, who? where? what? 83, 84.

Apocrypha, and the Vulgate declared by the Trent Council to be of Divine authority, 142; in what sense, 143; arguments against this, 148-150; all thus a novel fiction, 160 and 312.

Ass with five legs, relics of, 305.

Auricular Confession, 266; it originates five great evils, 268.

B

Baptismal regeneration, one of the delusive and mortal errors of popery, 294; by what men this is advocated, 295; refutation of it, 296.

Berkely, his absurdities matched by transubstantiation, 188.

Bible, according to popery, is "not a sufficient rule and guide;" this deism rebuked, 159; the Bible a prohibited book by Rome, 161, 162. What the Holy Bible is in the pope's kirk, 166; the Bible and popery cannot travel together,—parable of the two pots of iron and clay travelling, 167, 168.

Bible Societies denounced by the papal doctors, 166.

Blasphemy, a variety of specimens of papal, 307-311.

Bossuet and **Edgar** noticed as champions of their respective churches, 70, 71. *Note.*

Brownlee, Dr. his character of this volume, 19, 20.

Burnet, Bishop, his idea of the spirit of discussion, 39.

C

Cannibals. By the eating of the body and blood, literal, of Christ, in the mass wafer, men are made cannibals, 194.

Catholic; this title not conceded to the papal sect,—the true name of it, 76. Reason of this, 77, 78. Romanite, papite, the true titles, reasons, 79.

Celibate of priests, two arguments for it, 275; object of it, pecuniary gain to the pope, 274; five other imaginary arguments for it, 275; the pope cherishes *celibacy*, and leaves priestly *chastity* to take care of itself, 279; it is the source of boundless vileness and pollution, 279.

Celibacy and **Owenism**, 52-55; celibacy and misery, 55-57.

Chastity of priests left by the pope to take care of itself, 279; priestly practice contrasted with that of Luther, 281.

Chillingworth and **Chalmers**, matches for **Bossuet** and **Bellarmino**, 70.

Christ's body in the mass wafer, a body not born of woman, hence not his body, 191. Christendom, divisions of, 71.

Collier's faith, the faith of papites, "Believe as the church believes," 172.

Confession, auricular, 266; it originates five grievous evils, 268; it displays the tyranny, hypocrisy, and lewdness of priests, 270.

Confirmation, a papal sacrament, 282; its real object and design, 288.

Controversy, the spirit of, 39.

Critiques of foreign reviews in this volume, 21-34.

Crucifixes and **crosses**; worship of God by them unscriptural and impious, 230.

Cup denied to the laity by Roman priests, reasons of this, 218; arguments against this atrocious sacrilege, 219; reason, Scripture, primitive practice, against it, 219; the true reason and design of the priests in this tyranny, 219; Pope **Gelasius** against their modern practice, 219. *Note.*

D

Deism, the tendency of papists to it; it destroys the logical foundation of the Holy Scriptures, 198-201.

Devil's master-piece, popery so called by Cecil, 64.

Drelincourt, quotes the dying words of Cardinal Perrou, 185.

Duration of popery, 84, 85.

E

Eucharist, see transubstantiation and mass.

Excommunication by priests; what, exposition, refutation of this tremendous weapon of ghostly despotism, 259, 260; it is presumption, pride, and blasphemy, 262.

Extremo unction, facetiously made a pope's sacrament, 286; base design of, 292.

F

Fictions, popery a collection of modern, in eighteen specimens, 312-315.

Fletcher's lectures on the Catholic religion, great value of, 214. Note.

Frauds, an engine of papal support, 67.

G

Grace, conferred through the sacraments, an essential and fatal error of popery, 293.

Government civil, union of the church, or papal kirk with, produces persecution, 175.

Greek tongue; six reasons why rational men should have preferred the Greek to the Latin, in case of selecting an "unknown tongue" for the laity, 180-182. Reasons which induced the papists to select the Latin, 183, 184.

H

Host, worship of the, what, 216; the grossest of modern idolatry, proof of this, 217. No papist can have the faith in the Host,—doctrine of intention, 217.

Note. Saying of pope Adrian VI. on this,—“If thou be Christ, I worship thee!”

217. The same argument by which the priests sanction this Host worship, will sanction the worship of any conspicuous object of nature, 220. Note.

Hume; the dark and dire spirit of Hume's philosophisms matched by the vagaries of transubstantiation, 188, and Note.

I

Idolatry of the papal church, twofold, 220; it is unscriptural, 221; it is irrational, 222. Invoking a saint as mediator, unscriptural and irrational, 223. By idolatry papists dishonor Almighty God—by their “merit” they glorify man, 235.

Indulgences, what, exposure of them, 255, &c.

Images, worship of God by them most solemnly condemned by the Scriptures, 230.

The papists leave out the second commandment, this condemns themselves, 230.

Effect of this image worship on the human mind, 231. Objection, answer, 231.

Implicit faith in priests, hence the power of priestcraft, 170.

Index prohibitory, 173.

Infallibility, what? not in the pope, not in councils, 130. Eight arguments against it, 123-130, a demonstration of its utter absurdity, 123-133; found no where, 135; how far does it extend,—absurdity of this, 135, 136; the Bible decidedly against it, 137, 138; it is an impudent imposture in every sense, 139; pretenders to infallibility of three kinds, 140; one definition of infallibility will make it extend to all who agree in one, all the Reformed churches, 140, 141; differences of papists on this article go against their infallibility, 141; true infallibility found only in God and the Holy Bible, 142.

Infidelity, is popery run to seed, 62.

Inquisition, Dr. Pye Smith's remark on the, 65, this and persecution the two supporters of popery, 66.

Intention, chances of failure of, in transubstantiation, 206, 217. Note. Refutation of this terrible power of ghostly ambition, 297-300; the difficulties attending it, 301.

Irish bishop's response to pope Leo XII's Bull against Bible Societies, 170.

J

Jesuits, zeal and labors of, 12.

John the apostle had a better right to the primacy, if any had, 92; further proof, 104.

Justification and sanctification, exhibited in the two sacraments, and hence but *two*, 287.

K

Kirk, used in preference to church, why, 37; different kirks, 71.

Knowledge and philosophy, feared and proscribed by papist priests, 162, 165, 166.

L

Latin tongue of papism, 175; absurdity of the unknown tongue system, 176-179. Design of this by Rome, 180.

Leo XII. the pope denounced Bible Societies, 169; the response of the Irish bishops to this impious attack on the Bible, 170.

Liberty, course of, against papism, 51.

Lyrin, Vincentius, his views of infallibility, and what? 140.

Luther and the Pope in contrast on marriage and celibacy, 281.

M

Magna Charta of English liberty obtained by papal barons, but declared null and void by pope Innocent, 261.

Mass, full review of, 210, its monstrous absurdity, 210, 211; is unreasonable, 211, 212; is unscriptural, 213; it gives the lie to St. Paul in Hebrews, 215. The real use and design of the mass, to glorify and give power to the pope and priests, 215, 216.

Matrimony ludicrously made a sacrament, 226; priests' aim in this, 291.

Merit, papal doctrine, what,—of three uses, monstrous impiety of this, 234; by this they glorify man, as by idolatry they dishonor God, 235; its fatal tendency, 235; it is impracticable and impossible to do more merit than what God requires, 236-238; an appeal to papists on this, 239.

Milton's ode on the Piedmontese massacre, 67.

Ministers have their wives in holy wedlock, priests have their concubines, 281.

Miracles, the dogma of the mass tends to take away the evidence of our Lord's miracles, 201, 202.

Miracle-mongers, each Roman priest is a,—he creates bodies, souls, and even his Creator, 193.

Modernity of the system of papism, in *eighteen* specimens, 312-315.

Monstrous doctrines of the mass,—body of Christ in it, not born—every where, human flesh eaten by the priests' dogmas, 193, 194. Monstrous ideas of the soul in the mass wafer, 195, 196. Christ eaten alive, yet the wafer is dead, 196. Priests swallow his soul, 196, 197; they swallow his divinity,—they actually avow this, 197, 198, 204.

N

Nephews and nieces, the unusual number of, in papal countries, in consequence of the priests' celibacy, 280.

Nepotism, whence its origin, 281.

Novelty of popery,—retaliation of the charge of papists on us, 311; "Where was your religion before the council of Trent?" 312. Eighteen specimens of its novelty, 312-315.

O

Orders, holy, a papal sacrament; refutation of, 284; the proud design of, 290.

Owenism, atheism of, 52; and priestly celibacy, 53, 54, 55.

Oxford and Jesuits, 13.

Oxford Tracts,—"*Oxford Tracts*," 69; popery the same in Rome and in Oxford, 69.

- Popes**, character of, 106; how they arrived at papal power, by armies, frauds,—and some of them by their mistresses, 107, 108; the popes primaty, 87.
- Papism**, apathy of many on this subject, 12; excitement increasing on it, 14. Papism as it is, 40; tendency of it, 41; its influence on Pagans, Jews, and Mohammedans, 42, 43; papism and Owenism, 53; peculiar character of papism, 63, 64; it has been sustained by persecution and the inquisition, 66, 174; by frauds, 67; it is the fond invention of men, 67; papism is still papism, 69; works against popery, 69; papal unity and plurality, 72; some worthy papites, 79; *Note* on this, 79; popery at war with reason, the Bible, and antiquity, 80-82; papism placed in contrast with the Holy Bible, 167; it is at war with our senses, deprives us of the necessary use of them, and in the place of all these gives us the pope's *infallibility*, 189; papism is "a cunning compound of superficial truth and solid error," 293; it is a system of NOVEL FICTIONS,—eighteen proofs and specimens of its NOVELTY, 312-315.
- Penance** a papal sacrament, refutation of it, 283; true despotic design of it, 289.
- Ferron**, cardinal, the dying words of; called transubstantiation "A MONSTER," 185.
- Persecution**, one main pillar of papism, 65; number of its victims of persecution, 66.
- Peter** never had any supremacy, 88-91; even if he had, it did not descend, 97-99; inquiry if he ever was at Rome, 101, 102.
- Phocas**, the tyrant, made Boniface, the bishop of Rome, the first pope, 85.
- Poisoned bread and wine**, a grand and infallible means proposed to the priests to test transubstantiation, 205.
- Politikirkality** in papism, this originates persecution for religion, 175.
- Priest**, true idea of a, 37; a filthy and unchaste creature, 281.
- Priestcraft**, most strikingly displayed in auricular confession, 267, &c. A striking picture of it in the mass-houses, and papal worship, 303. The marvellous trumpet-ery employed by it to delude the senses of men, 304.
- Purgatory**, what it is, 239,—its real use to support priestal power over man, 239, 240; it is unscriptural in the basis it assumes, 240; hostile to Christ's atonement, 241; it opposes the work of the Holy Ghost, 241, 242; it nurses impiety and immorality, 241; it tends to make the sinner neither to fear nor regard hell, 244; it is a tremendous weapon of priestly tyranny, 245, 246; it insults the Almighty, and sets up a new way of cleansing sinners, apart from the Lord's atonement, 246, 247; it reverses the quack saying, and says, *no pay, no cura*, 257. Purgatory represents priests as cruel and savage, 257.
- Puseyism** and popery, 69.

R

- Reformed church**; in her the ministry have their wives and children; in the papal church the priests have their concubines, and bastards called nephews and neices, 279-282.
- Regeneration**, baptismal, Rome's fatal error, 294; by whom advocated, 295; refutation of, 296.
- Relics**, their folly and impiety, 305.
- Rock**, the famous text of the, examined, 93-96.
- Rogers**, John, our author. The object of this book, 9, 10, 45. He coins new words, 45, 51. *Note*, 86.

S

- Sacraments**, the papal seven, 283; there are only two in number, one reason, 287.
- Saints**, invocation of as intercessors, unscriptural and irrational, 223, &c. Objections of the papites answered, 225. Invocation of them as intercessors with Christ, unscriptural and irrational, 226. Papite objection answered, 228.

- Scriptures; the priests palm the absurdities and impiety of the mass on them, hence deism, 200.
- Sectaries abroad in the world, 49, 50.
- Senses of man testify against the impiety and absurdity of transubstantiation, 187: our Lord appeals to them for his identity, 189, 201.
- Smith, Dr. J. Pye; remark on the inquisition, 65.
- Soul of Christ, where to be found in the mass wafer, 195.
- Superstition essentially an element of popery, 301.
- Supremacy or primacy of the pope, ten proofs against it, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92. Papal arguments examined, 93, 97; not only the abuses of it condemned, but the primacy itself, 106, 101; the papal supremacy comes not from Christ, or by St. Peter, but from the pagan emperor who had the title of "*Pontifex Maximus*," 103. Supremacy lost if it ever did exist, in the popes, 105.

T

- Talmud, traditions of the, 150.
- Traditions; what, nature of, Hebrew traditions, 151; Romish traditions, 151, 152. Nine arguments against oral traditions, 153-158.
- Transubstantiation, definition—a monster, 185; Cardinal Perren called it so, 185. Our Lord's soul, according to the papists, is in the wafer, 186; it is not the old body of, but a new body that is made, 186; many bodies, absurdity, 187, 190, 194; Eighteen arguments against this irrational and impious fiction, 187, &c.; it makes Christ's body omnipresent, 189, &c.; this body in the mass wafer not born of woman, hence not Christ's body, 191; this impious dogma represents Christ's living body breaking to pieces, the self-same body in the wafer, 191; it makes a whole Christ in each wafer and in each particle—an infinity of bodies, 192; it makes men cannibals, 194; this dogma makes infidels, 198, 199, 200; this is a suicidal doctrine, 201; even if true, it could not be proved, 203; a grand test of its truth formally proposed, by poisoned bread and wine, 205; the chances against a genuine change of the wafer into Christ, 205-207; the only argument for this novel doctrine, 207; reply to, and refutation of this, 207, 208; it involves error, falsehood and the mortal sin of idolatry, 216. Note.
- Triple crown of the pope figures forth the great earthly three,—*Molech*, *Mammon*, and *Belial*, 66.

U

- Unction, extreme, facetiously styled a sacrament in the papal kirk, 286; the true design of this by despotic priests, 292.
- Unity and plurality of papism, 72-75. Unity in papism, and in Protestantism fairly compared, 73.
- Unknown tongues, 170.

V

- Victims, number of, slain by papal persecution, 66.
- Vulgate and apocrypha declared to be of Divine authority by the Council of Trent, 142; in what sense Divine 142. Reasons against the Divine authority of the Vulgate, 143-148.

W

- Wives; Luther and the reformed ministers have their wives, but priests have their concubines, 281.
- Worship of papists in their mass-houses, a true picture of, 303.
- Writers on papism, 17; kind of, required in this cause, 69, 70.

PREFACE BY THE AUTHOR.

I have here to inform the reader that what was formerly called *Antipopopriestian*, is now called *Anti-Popery*, the name of the work being changed in order more clearly to indicate its nature. The former edition contained some remarks not relating to Popery, that are omitted here; and the present edition is confined to Popery. In the work as now altered or amended, the reader will not find the extraneous matter, the particulars foreign to the great subject of the book, that were in the former edition; he will not find any remark (so far as I remember) really painful to the mind, or very opposite to the view of any real Protestant. The work now relates to Popery, the whole of Popery, and nothing but Popery; and therefore will, I hope, be acceptable or unobjectionable to the whole Protestant world, and even to the whole christian world that oppose the plan of papal Rome.

Having exerted myself in defending Protestantism against Popery, I am advised, by both churchmen and dissenters, to let my next literary effort be in defence of Religion at large against Infidelity, by bringing out a work (that has cost much time and thought) on *Moral Freedom and Responsibility*, in opposition to the Fatalist, Infidel, and Sceptic. I incline to follow the advice; for Popery and Infidelity, or rather Infidelity and Popery, are the two leading enemies we have to oppose.

THE PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

One of the striking characteristics of this literary age, is the deep and earnest attention bestowed on the subject of Romanism by the best writers and reviewers of America and Britain. Some eighty or a hundred years ago, the subject was deemed to be exhausted; no one could say any more on the subject. There had been giants before our day, who had left nothing to be done by those who came after. It was, therefore, useless for any writer to enter the field of discussion strewn with the trophies of Protestant victory. The last word had been said: the last argument exhausted. "The Beast" was dying: it was convulsed in the head and members. It was a waste of strength and ammunition to continue the attack on the dying "Dragon." The result was what might have been anticipated by an "earnest contender for the faith once delivered to the saints." The Protestant watchmen and warriors, with the exception of a gallant and faithful few, turned away their eyes *exclusively* to other objects; and did no more deem the expiring "Man of Sin" worthy of any further watching, or even a serious consideration. And even to this day, even in the eulogized light of the nineteenth century, how many do yet actually profess to assure themselves that there can be no possible danger from Popery and Jesuitism, either to our holy religion or our civil liberties. They can see no need of watching; no need of defence against the inroads of papism; although even under their own eyes, and in our own life-time, the humble and obscure bishop or two have been increased to upwards of twenty bishops; and the narrow diocese has extended to upwards of twenty extensive dioceses;

while Jesuit seminaries are reared on every hand: and the land swarms with priests and nuns, sisters of charity and sisters of mercy of every gradation, and friars white, black and grey. They aim at converting our land into a Spain or an Austria, in a short time.

Meantime another species of multiform popery, under the name of deism, and atheism, arrested the attention, and summoned forth the watchful energies of the christian warriors. Even so late as thirty or forty years ago, our pulpits resounded universally with all the eloquence of argument and declamation against deism. Hume, and Voltaire, and Paine were in every lip. Every minister wrote, and spoke, and entered the arena of public discussion against deism, and atheism. And our fathers in the ministry and many religious laymen having pummeled these two emissaries of Rome, and driven them into a shameful and hopeless obscurity, they have been lying on their oars, and doffing their arms; for having annihilated these rampant foes, they can see no danger of papal Rome invading the church and our free republic in its old and wonted form. They have so long dreamed over their deistic victories, that they seem actually not yet awake to the appalling fact that Jesuitism is resuscitated, and in the fullest and most vigilant and wonted vigorous activity! And what were Hume, Voltaire, Gibbon, Paine, and all the higher and minor champions, compared to the phalanx of desperate Jesuits moving in over Britain and our republic, with a moral force propelled by all the combined hatred and force of deism and atheism, and Rome and the Holy Alliance; and never to be stayed or subdued, but by God and the energies of a christian and republican people!

For, while these infidels,—the enemies of God and man, who were let loose, at the French Revolution, upon Britain and our republic,—were thus falling and fleeing before the Lord's host, as the hosts of Midian before the

sword of the Lord and Gideon; the watchful and recruited powers of Rome began to raise their heads; and have been putting forth their last desperate struggle to regain all that they had lost by the Reformation. These struggles of Rome and the *De Propaganda*, now animated by the demon power of Jesuitism, and directed against Protestant truth and liberty, have been long carefully concealed. And every advancing step of the foes was soft and sly; and no overt cause of alarm given to Protestants. "Strike! but let it not be seen whence the blow comes!" this has been the watchword, uttered by the dark and designing provincial; and whispered along the gloomy and lowering ranks of the reckless sons of Loyola!

But, at the close of the late wars of Europe, Pius VII. having regained his tiara and throne, girded up his loins, and began his last desperate effort to regain no less than all the former papal power and ascendancy in the world. Adopting pope Paul III. as his model, he revived the sect of Jesuits, the bitterest and most successful and sanguinary of all the enemies of the reformation. This outrage upon the honor and liberties of the European powers, and upon us in this republic, was done in 1814, without even a remonstrance from the slumbering Protestant powers. And these Jesuits have been, since that era, busily at their dark work, with all their former powers, learning, cunning, duplicity, and immeasurable atheism and licentiousness! They spare no pains nor expense. They hesitate at no sacrifice of truth, honor, morals, men's lives. They peril their own personal safety, and even their souls' salvation, to obey the pope! They form one solid column of the Babylonian host, moving on, with the most abject submission to their despotic and cold-blooded provincial, to any work assigned them, to any warfare, to any service, moral or immoral, loyal or treasonable, christian, or literary, or profane,

or atheistic! Bound to the car of their idol, the Roman Juggernaut, they are prepared to sacrifice for its interests their health, their conscience, their life; and I repeat it, even their souls' eternal salvation! Milton represents his demon as one who would "rather reign in hell, than serve in heaven." But the Jesuits outstrip that proud Lucifer. They would rather serve as slaves their haughty lord, than "serve in heaven or rule in hell!" They are imperialists with the emperor; royalists with the king; republicans with the republicans; Jews with the Jew; infidels with the deist; atheist with the atheist! They are puritans with the dissenter; high churchmen with the Oxfordites! They are presbyterians among the presbyterians; they are pushing themselves forward among all classes, and all sects, in morals, literature, religion, politics! If they hear of a protestant missionary eminently successful at his station, be it in the old world or new world, they hasten through all perils by sea and land, through fire and water, to prevent the conversion of heathens! If they find a people abandoning their gods, they bring them a new set of glittering idols! If they find the chiefs and people at peace, they kindle the flames of discord and war. If they find difficulty in corrupting the public morals, they introduce intoxicating liquors, and boundless licentiousness, by their confessional and their nunneries!

In a word, they are playing the same deep game, to the fullest extent of their vast means, which their predecessors played of old in the wide field of Europe and America. And now, without concealment or blush, they are boasting that they will soon be what their forefathers were, in their unparalleled ascendancy in every court, in every government, whither they can force or worm their way. And their object, for ever kept in their eye, is the extinction of the light, the purity, the liberties, and glory of our blessed reformation! Their war of exter-

mination is waged against pure christianity and liberty!

There are *two* reasons, not usually noticed by writers, which paved the way secretly, but too effectually, for the papal success in Protestant Britain. *First*, Rome was on the British side, and in her interests in her struggles in the late wars of Britain with France; and Rome even caused a medal to be struck in honor of her mighty *Protestant ally*, with the motto, "*Rome protected by the British cannon!*" *Second*: At the beginning of the French revolution great multitudes of emigrants, popish priests, friars, and seculars, and nuns, and literary men, flocked into Britain, especially England. These found their way into innumerable families of the higher and middle classes, as tutors, governesses, and school-masters; and these repaid their benefactors by sowing copiously the seeds of popery. And the present generation are reaping the bitter and fatal fruits!

But a crisis has been induced, and is steadily approaching. The Jesuits from the *De Propaganda*, and the Oxford doctors, their overt auxiliaries, have been pushing matters rather too fast, and too far, for their own security. These combined emissaries of Rome had probably calculated in doing their work of proselytism thoroughly, while the dissenters and voluntaries were engaged in the present pitched battle with the doctors of the established churches of England and Scotland. The former seem even to court the papists as their auxiliaries in overthrowing the establishments; and the papists are nothing loth to smile on their labors and lend them a helping-hand. But this is done and managed by them, just as the fox in the fable managed to keep up the keen combat of the lion and the tiger, in order that he might seize the carcass. They urge on the conflict; they wish both parties to be devoured and eaten up, in order that they may come quietly in and seize the entire prey!

But we rejoice to see that the men of God in Britain, who ought long ago to have hastened into the field for the help of the Lord's bleeding cause, are now roused from their long and heavy sleep. The most accomplished preachers are now sounding the alarm. Eloquence and literature are putting forth their choice and most admired sons into the thickening and tumultuous battle with Rome. The most prominent and influential ministers are uniting in regular courses of lectures against the popery of Rome and the popery of Oxford. The General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland has enacted that each of her ministers, in each parish in the kingdom, shall preach once each month on the ruinous heresies and innumerable evils and dangers of Romanism. And the number of able writers, and the number of thoroughly equipped disputants descending into the arena of public discussions with priests; and the number and variety of books teeming from the press against the "man of sin," "the beast," and "false prophet," are almost incredible! The beginning of the end of Romanism has taken place!

Among these, we hail JOHN ROGERS, Esq. the author of the following work, entitled, "*Anti-Popery; or Popery unreasonable, unscriptural, and novel.*" And we cordially bid him welcome into the field as a spiritual warrior against Antichrist, of no ordinary zeal, activity, and prowess.

The reader will find this volume of Mr. Rogers an original and extraordinary work. The author displays talents of the very highest order; a mind accomplished, and thoroughly disciplined by divine truth. He takes a clear and comprehensive view of each portion in the detail, of the Roman Catholic controversy, now occupying so extensively the deepest and most intense interest at home and abroad. He selects with great sagacity and judgment the most prominent topics. His argu-

ments are choice, logical, and precise. He does not stop to throw any unnecessary ornament around them. He disdains to pause in his urgent career, to dispute on small matters. He does not suffer himself to be turned aside from his main object. He marches directly up into the breach made by the well-directed force of Divine truth, and seizes upon the very citadel itself. He is brief on every point; some will think him too brief. It is true he enters into no long and profound investigation; he leaves that to the learned theologians and Biblical scholars. He does not, like the unmatched SAMUEL EDGAR, in his "VARIATIONS OF POPERY," battle the foemen with their own weapons, gathered so successfully from their own armory and that of their fathers. He does not stop to clinch each statement by an unquestionable quotation from Roman bulls and canons. He leaves that to be done by Cramp, in his "Text-Book of Popery." He does not go slowly over the field, and touch upon and exhaust each topic. He leaves that to the fascinating and successful anti-popery man, M'Gaven, of "The Glasgow Protestant." He writes studiously, in a popular manner, for the people. Dr. Usher, Dr. James, in his "Bellum Papale," and his "Treatise on the Roman Corruptions of the Scriptures, the Councils, and the Fathers;" and Willet, in his "Synopsis Papismi;" Edgar, Finch, Mendham, Chillingworth, unmatched by any disputant in clearness, force, and logical accuracy, and a host of giants of this class, wrote for scholars and divines. But John Rogers, Esq. writes this book for studious youth, and the Protestant people, and also for Roman Catholic people; and he has displayed that remarkable tact which men of talents only do possess, namely, that of adapting his statements, illustrations, and appeals, to every one; and to captivate every class of even the most careless students. The theologian who has deeply studied the history and dog-

mas of papism, will not, indeed, find much that is new here. But, the manner of treating the whole subject possesses novelty; and to the great mass of the people of our republic, both the matter and his manner will be found new and fascinating. He is at antipodes with the bulky folio-writers of the past centuries, and especially of those who lived near the Reformation. He sifts out the grains of wheat from the chaff and inferior grain,—the verbiage and repetitions of those great men,—and he sets it before us well winnowed, and in a state to be converted into genuine and nutritious food for our souls.

The numerous eulogies bestowed on the *first* edition of this work by the British and Irish Reviewers, which we have herewith republished, and the praises of our own best critics, will abundantly sustain me in all parts of this my hearty commendations of this work, which we now present to the American public. At the same time, I must not forget to add, that as the *second* English edition—from which we print and stereotype this first American edition—is far superior to the first, the author having greatly improved and thoroughly corrected it: so, as I have had the benefit of the volunteered assistance of my estimable and reverend friend, Dr. Brownlee, in making corrections, valuable additions, with notes, and an index, I may venture to say that this will be found to be superior to the second English edition. I trust, therefore, that this attempt to satisfy and please the American public with a new and greatly improved edition of J. Rogers' "*ANTI-POPERY*," will be duly appreciated at the hands of their obedient and devoted servant, for Jesus Christ's sake,

CHARLES SPARRY.

NEW-YORK, April, 1841.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

This work of JOHN ROGERS I have examined with considerable care, and very great interest. The British and Irish reviews of the first edition, as appears from the following numerous quotations from them, exhibit one continuous eulogium upon it. And after examination, I am satisfied that there is no exaggeration in their praises. This new champion—whom we welcome into the field—richly merits their applause and ours. The author, it is said, is an eminent counsellor at law, in London. He displays a mind at once vigorous, thoroughly disciplined, and possessed of great critical acumen. He is tolerably well acquainted with the best books on the Roman Catholic controversy. Guided by these, he fixes upon the more prominent points of Papism; states them with accuracy and candor, and selects his arguments with admirable discrimination. And while his language is most obliging, and his whole manner, as it ought to be, perfectly courteous, he lays hold of his opponent's entire creed, rites, and ceremonies, with a giant's grasp, from which there is no escape. And the reader rises from the perusal of the book, fully satisfied with the manner in which Mr. Rogers has utterly annihilated the defence of a system which all good men have pronounced to be as detestable as it is dangerous to the souls of men; which is at irreconcilable war with reason and the Holy Scriptures; and which history has pronounced to be a combination of all errors and heresies, mixed up with modern fictions, ludicrous fables, and puerile ceremonies borrowed from heathenism by THE MAN OF SIN.

If Mr. Rogers has a weak part in his argument,—it is this:—he does not stop to give his readers the copious authorities, which he might easily have given from the Doctors, the Canons, and Bulls of the papal "Kirk," to sustain his charges and strengthen his arguments. His opponents in Britain may, perhaps, not pursue the disreputable course pursued by our jesuit disputants in the United States. If they do, Mr. Rogers will find

them actually denying the most accurate quotations—and even their own books—and even the notes of the Rhemish New Testament—although these are composed either of quotations from "the Fathers," or of doctrines taught by the canons and bulls of Rome! Hence, if Mr. Rogers continues his argument—as he must do in his own defence—he will soon discover the necessity of not only indicating the volume, the chapter, the page, and the edition whence he quotes his materials, but of establishing the authenticity and authority of even *the papal standard works*! For the jesuit priests and bishops, with face of bronze, avowedly act on the old resuscitated maxims of the sons of Loyola—"Admit nothing; deny every thing, when reasoning with *heretics*!"

The style of Rogers is sententious, clear, and forcible; and possesses great logical precision. With its richness, however, there is a singular quaintness. And to some, his new nomenclature will seem, at first, rather singular. For "church," he invariably uses "kirk;" for "primacy," "primaty;" "papite and Romanite," for "papist and Romanist;" "perhap," for "perhaps;" also, "nowafter," for "hereafter;" and "priestal," and "priest ruled," and "priestrulive," "politikirkal," and "politikirkalian."

And we are not unwilling to admit that he is sustained in all this, by the reasons and authorities which he advances. He has put us in mind, more than once, of the fine, old, manly, vigorous, and majestic style of Milton's prose. And we like it the more for this very reason.

W. C. BROWNLEE,

*One of the Collegiate Pastors of the Prot. Ref.
Dutch Church in New-York.*

NEW-YORK, April, 1841.

CRITIQUES ON THE FORMER EDITION.

"In this work, the Pope and his adherents are pummelled by a most vigorous antagonist in a way that will make their bones ache for many a day. Mr. Rogers has not only assailed the leading errors, and absurdities, and blasphemies of the Babylonish religion, but has attacked, unripped, and exposed, *seriatim*, the details of the idolatry of the Romish Anti-Christ. He fastens on the hoary delinquent with the pertinacity of a mastiff, and never relinquishes his hold till he has shaken him and his trappings to tatters. He exposes the naked deformity of the whole heap of cardinals, monks, nuns, and friars,

'Black, white, and grey, with all their trumpery,'

and fairly kicks them out of the pale of the religion of the Bible, which they have so long disgraced with their absurdities, obscenities, and delusions. Mr. Rogers is no common combatant. He is armed at all points; and dexterous in the management of all weapons of attack and defence. *This work should be read, and will be read by all Protestants. It has conferred a service on Protestantism*, and placed in the possession of every Protestant, a manual for his protection from error and deceit. The whole subject of Popery is examined with judgment and learning by a man of strong mind, considerable erudition, and indefatigable industry. The result is, as may be supposed, an excellent work essentially excellent in its object, and decisive in its reasoning. An extract from the chapter 'An Account of Popery,' will induce the reader to go through the whole work."—*Times*.

"It is the production of an original mind, and a sound thinker, and one truly earnest in the Protestant cause.

"We should regard it as little short of a calamity to the interest of truth, were the title of this volume to operate as a

hinderance to its extensive circulation. Strange as it may at first sight appear to be, we are disposed to think that, upon examination, it will be found to be etymologically correct and appropriate. But whatever judgment may be formed of a name consisting of seventeen letters, and forming an entirely new coinage of the author's own, we beg to assure our readers that the work itself is one of the most original, elaborate, searching, and conclusive exposures of Romanism that has seen the light in modern times. It is hopeless, perhaps, to suppose that Catholics will read it; but this we will say, that an unprejudiced Catholic could scarcely rise from its perusal the dupe of Romish superstition. But the value of the work, at the present juncture, as a weapon in the hands of Protestants, is great beyond what we can well express. Those who will determine to surmount the prejudice which certain features pertaining to Mr. Rogers' style may possibly create, will soon find that they are holding converse with a mind of the *first order*, and that Rome in his hands is tossed about upon the horns of a thousand dilemmas. The author possesses great powers of logical discrimination, and knows how to select the weak point in his antagonist's argument, and to bear down upon him with almost annihilating force.

"There is moreover nothing prolix, nothing verbose, nothing weak or trifling in Mr. Rogers' mode of attack. He opens a broadside in every instance, at once, upon the enemy; and trusts the victory to great principles rather than to minute and feeble details. He uses very strong language indeed in portraying the horrible abominations of Popery; but as he speaks not politically, we like his honest and uncompromising denunciations of "the man of sin," who is "the son of perdition." Those who wish to see a thorough dissection of Popery, in all its hideous deformity, as the direct antagonist of the Gospel, and the inveterate enemy of human kind, will find in Mr. Rogers' work a mental feast equally refreshing and invigorating. What will Papists do with this book? We predict that they will either pass it by in dignified silence, or misrepresent all its arguments and details by that jesuitical sophistry for which their best writers are shamefully notorious. If Mr. Rogers is spared, we cannot help thinking, from this specimen of his pen, that he is destined to be the troubler of Rome. We trust he will watch Dr.

Wiseman and the *Dublin Review*, and make them feel his withering touch. He is fit to grapple with them, and he should know it, and not shrink from the task at a time when Popery is stalking abroad in the land with a boldness and an effrontery unknown of late years in Great Britain."—*Evangelical Magazine*.

"Here are manifest and numerous proofs of integrity of purpose, ardency of spirit, and a love for the truth, with great originality and strength of thought. . . We doubt not that in consequence of his efforts, discussions will be elicited that may tend to bring back many sections of the church to a nearer approximation with the faith once delivered to the saints. In this work he assails the errors of Popery, and with a giant arm. . . He grasps a ponderous club 'like a weaver's beam,' and marching with firm and fearful step into the very camp of papal error, deals out, 'right and left,' tremendous blows which lay whole armies groaning at his feet. The rigid application of the ordinary rules of composition will not answer here. In waging polemic war, the genius of Mr. Rogers, like that of our Nelson in naval fight, must be honored with a roving commission. His *forte* is his own—he must be *unique*. . . Our gratitude rises high indeed when we consider that he has rendered signal service to the sacred cause of truth. We restrain our pen—and assure Mr. Rogers that on the subject of Popery he need fear no opponent—he is invincible—a rock not to be moved. In the forthcoming works we anticipate discussions, the very sound of the near approach of which, judging from the present production, is enough to make those whose interest and spirit lead them to espouse such principles, quail and tremble. . . The perusal of this extraordinary book has made us feel that Mr. Rogers is a learned, intelligent, sound, and godly Protestant champion, of consummate skill and Herculean power."

Methodist New Connexion Magazine.

"Mr. Rogers' logical acuteness and Herculean power as a polemical writer, are displayed in a manner that must be truly astounding to the abettors of the papal system. . . The author wastes no time in useless parleys, but, conscious of the strength

of his arm and the goodness of his cause, he brings the heavy artillery of his logic to bear on the strong-holds of his enemy; and having, without much difficulty, effected a practicable breach, rushes to the onslaught, and triumphantly completes the work of utter demolition.... The style of the work is lucid, vigorous, and melodious. * * * * A book which, as a concise refutation of the leading errors of Popery, so far as our knowledge extends, is without a rival in the English language; and proves Mr. Rogers to be decidedly an original and *first-rate* reasoner; and a man who, with Davy, Drew, and others, will nobly uphold the literary glory of Cornwall."—*West Briton*.

"This work is one of surpassing merit. It is perhaps the most searching and successful exposure of the errors of Popery which has ever appeared. Mr. Rogers has brought all the energies of his powerful mind to bear upon the subject, and has made out a case against the papal system which must fill with alarm every votary of the Romish faith. It is a perfect armory, out of which those who would fight the battles of the Protestant faith may at all times equip themselves."—*Observer*.

"It is clear and simple, straightforward and conclusive, and altogether the most logical and searching dissection of Popery that we ever encountered in any form. If any person have a doubt between Protestantism and Popery, let him read the present work. Infallibility, transubstantiation, auricular confession, &c. are each, in turn, hurled to the earth—remorselessly and irretrievably trampled into the mire—annihilated; and all this by the clearest, the most logical, the most searching and irrefutable arguments. That Mr. Rogers is a man of extensive reading, and a scholar, is apparent from every page of his book. His solutions of the famous 'Grecian Dilemma' and 'Pseudomenos,' are masterly."—*Court Journal*.

"Mr. Rogers wields his polemical cudgel with terrible effect hitting Rome right and left with a rapid succession of the hardest blows she ever received."—*Grant's London Journal*.

"An extraordinary work, full of learning and sound sense. The reasoning is close and conclusive, and the arguments almost superabundant. One of the most remarkable productions of our day. JOHN ROGERS exhibits proofs of profound thought and extensive erudition, and will be recognised as one of the *master-spirits* of the age."—*Era*.

"This is a work written with the intent to exhibit popery in its true light, and he who could rise from a perusal of its pages without having his mind stored with arguments unanswerable in their nature, against the monstrous politico-religious system of popery, can have made little use of his reasoning faculties. We should like to be placed on our defence, with this book in our hand, before the pope and a full conclave of cardinals, and if they chose to abide by the decision of twelve *honest* and *impartial* men, popery would be extinguished for ever before they left the jury-box. The map which accompanies the work we consider very valuable. It contains a graphic delineation of the errors of Popery, and the date of the introduction of each—which propositions are amply proved. The style is original, vigorous, and clear. The arguments are laid down with a force of diction which must overthrow all opposition—and every page contains the incontrovertible proofs from history. We know of no work which promises more efficient aid in the cause of Protestantism, or which opens a sharper fire on the falling cause of Popery. We hope that the advocates . . . of Rome . . . will candidly confess their errors after a perusal of this volume. . . . We sincerely recommend the perusal of this book to all Protestants, and to all Roman Catholics who wish to know what is truth."—*Dublin Statesman*.

"Seldom have we read so powerful a production. Mr. Rogers is gifted with a mind capable of the most logical precision—no fallacy, either in doctrine or in ethics, can endure his searching scrutiny. Hence the various errors and corruptions of Popery are here not merely exposed—they are absolutely demolished. The author is indeed a perfect 'Root and Branch' man; first applying the well-tempered knife of skilful excision,

then using the irresistible axe of utter eradication. We would defy Cardinal Bellarmine himself, if he were living, to answer this book As an effectual antidote to Papal error, we can cordially recommend the very extraordinary book before us."

Bath and Cheltenham Gazette.

"The work is full of learning and sound sense; and a very slight perusal of it will at once show the originality of Mr. Rogers, and that he is a profound thinker. Every thing about the book is original—the ideas, the style, and the construction. Even Roman Catholics must admit that he has placed himself in the position of a powerful leader of the Protestants. . . . He has shown, as far as argument goes, that he is possessed of a lion's strength. . . . We are convinced that most of our Protestant and Catholic readers will be acquainted with its contents."

Tyne Mercury.

"If the cry of '*No Popery*' shall have done nothing else than caused the appearance of this book, it will have done good service to mankind. A valuable, clear, and entertaining book. . . . the work of great labor and research, by a man thoroughly conversant with polemical controversy, and who yet has the rare power of simplifying his subject, and writing with ease, vigor, clearness, and benevolent warmth of spirit. No man, whether he be priest or layman, can peruse without advantage the powerful and elaborate articles in this work, on infallibility, transubstantiation, and tradition."—*Maidstone Gazette.*

"This is an extraordinary book. We have seldom seen Popery so vigorously handled. Mr. Rogers has taken up the question in all its bearings, and applied to it the powers of a masculine intellect trained to habits of searching analysis, and clear, logical, bold, and comprehensive reasoning. He sifts the lofty pretensions, and exposes the errors and impositions of the church of Rome, with unrelenting severity, showing its false, blasphemous, and anti-social character, its hostility to Scripture, reason, and antiquity . . . The work will prove a valuable auxiliary to the cause of Protestantism. No one possessing it, need

be at a loss to give to any one that asks him, a reason for preferring the religion of the Reformation to that of the usurping Italian bishop. Furnished with the weapons here supplied, he will be 'armed at all points' for resisting the subtleties and subterfuges of Jesuitical sophistry, or the open denial of plain facts by the barefaced assertors of the liberality of modern Romanism. The author's style is free and nervous He has rendered a service to the cause of truth, of civil liberty, and of social happiness, which cannot be too highly estimated."

Liverpool Courier.

"Mr. Rogers is a scholar every inch of him, and a man of dauntless mould . . The book is a good one, vigorous, racy, and original He has strength of mind and information enough to grapple successfully with any Goliath the Philistines may send against the truth."—*Congregational Magazine.*

"The book contains much that is valuable, and much that is seasonable. Popery is making great exertions to regain its former ascendancy in this country. Few have the time or the inclination, even if they had the ability, to follow the Papists in their ever-recurring references and appeals to decrees of popes and general councils, to the dogmas of *right reverend* fathers and tradition; and a book which would furnish Protestants with arguments against the anti-christian system, without the necessity of having recourse to such recondite and legendary lore, was greatly to be desiderated. Such a book we have before us We are convinced that a person, thoroughly master of its arguments and illustrations, need not be greatly afraid to encounter a whole host of friars, or even a general council, claiming infallibility as its prerogative Mr. Rogers proceeds to attack the system of Popery with right good will, and wields his weapons with a sturdy arm and a fearless heart. The towers and the battlements, the outworks and the citadel of her who sits on the seven hills, are vigorously assaulted, and irreparable damage done to her glory and her greatness. To change the figure: the lady on the scarlet-colored beast is made

to cut a very sorry figure, and is left in no very desirable plight. . . . The book is any thing but common-place—any thing but uninteresting. It shows its author to be an original thinker, a skilful logician, a close and powerful reasoner, and a fearless follower of truth . . . We take our leave of him, thanking him for the service he has done to the cause of truth by the stalwart and telling blows he has inflicted on the head of '*The Beast*.'”—*United Secession Magazine*.

"This is altogether an extraordinary book . . . The author has plenty of talent and learning . . . has pith and vast stores of knowledge . . . His style is very quaint and rich . . . Rogers is terse and strong, and delights to express his thoughts in short, clear, pointed sentences. He is, in fact, too sparing of words; and the mind has not sufficient time to rest upon a thought and prize its value . . . The volume is worthy of a careful perusal by all at the present moment, and especially by ministers. It is always masterly."—*Christian Journal or Relief Magazine*.

"There is enough in the material and structure of the work to constitute it really a good one. . . . There is an earnestness in the man, and withal a measure of clearness and force of conception, which we believe will fit him for usefulness in the kind of labor on which he has entered. . . . We are not disposed to attribute his quaint style or even his new words to affectation, so much as to a simple honest wish to do his work well—to strike the nail home. . . . His work has an enlightened spirit of toleration. His sentences seem to come down like the blows at Marston Moor and Naseby. There is that sort of heartiness in them which never fails to interest; and, like the true Cromwellian soldier, Mr. ROGERS not only does not understand what it is to be beaten, but seems to be incapable of thinking that he has done quite enough even when his victory is complete. . . . There is a distinctness in all the parts, and a consecutiveness in the whole. . . . We trust that we have said enough to induce many of our readers to possess themselves of this singular volume."—*Eclectic Review*.

"This work evinces great mental power, combined with ingenuity; and as the writer follows a process of his own in dealing with every subject that comes before him, there is much novelty in many of his illustrations. . . . His manner is discursive, frank, and occasionally sportive. . . . There is an ample exhibition of good sound sense; and we look forward with pleasure to the remainder of the journey in which he proposes to lead us, along less beaten paths, to the palace of universal freedom."—*Baptist Magazine*.

"It has seldom fallen to our lot to read so very singular and original a volume, or one containing so much energy of thought and solid argument. It is the production of a man of native genius. His writing is terse and clear.—The work is well adapted to promote the cause of christianity. We recommend this erudite and curious volume to the diligent and devout perusal of our readers, being fully assured that their labor therein will be richly repaid."—*Wesleyan Association Magazine*.

"We must say that we rise from the perusal of the work with a firm persuasion that no Romanist who will candidly and calmly weigh all the arguments against popery which it contains, will be able to remain a day longer within the pale of what has been improperly called 'the Roman Catholic church.' Mr. Rogers has assailed the leading errors and blasphemies in doctrine, and the most remarkable fooleries, absurdities, and vicious practices connected with popery, with such powerful arguments drawn from Scripture and reason, as cannot fail to carry conviction to every candid mind; while he has so fully laid bare the imposture, tricks, and pious frauds employed to support the monstrous system, as must render it really hateful to all who love the volume of inspiration, and are jealous for the glory of God. And all is done with an evenness of temper, and benevolence of feeling, which cannot fail of adding weight to the unanswerable arguments employed. It is a work which all protestants should carefully read. We heartily wish that papists in general may read the work, as we are satisfied they must see that the arguments are unanswerable."

Bible Christian Magazine.

"The author here shows himself to be a most daring foe to the popish religion; he takes the whole system of fraud and fallacy to pieces, cutting it up with the skill of an anatomist, and the rottenness of the whole papal constitution is amply demonstrated. John Rogers deserves thanks for this remarkable performance. His book will do good service to the cause of truth, reason, and common sense."

Sunday-School Teachers' Magazine

"Mr. Rogers' writings ought to acquire popularity. The volume before us bears the impress of fervent piety, and of considerable mental power. It has more than common literary merits. Our Roman Catholic friends will do well to peruse it; and if they find themselves able to refute the principles of the author's arguments, they will have no reason to fear an encounter with the ablest champions of protestantism. . . . We recommend this work."

Herald of Peace.

"In discussing the branches of Romanism, the author reasons powerfully, ingeniously, and with considerable originality of method. The sections on Infallibility, Transubstantiation, and Purgatory, are excellent specimens of argumentation, proving, in the most triumphant and satisfactory manner, that they are absurd and impious inventions, designed to uphold priestly power and priestly tyranny. With some of the other sections we have also been much pleased . . . Bearing down on popery with irresistible force, like a torrent, and pouring on it a deluge of severe and harsh epithets, the book annihilates the system . . . On the whole, we recommend it to our readers as an instructive, interesting, and amusing volume."—*Orthodox Presbyterian.*

"Upon a mature consideration of the arguments and facts which the learned writer of this work has produced against the errors of Popery, we must repeat our surprise that he has brought so much acuteness and such powerful reasoning to bear upon a subject which we had deemed exhausted. He is a strong and original thinker, and one of the most powerful anti-popery writers of the day."—*Bell's Weekly Messenger.*

"It confutes Papal error at all points, in a manner which it would puzzle the utmost resources of the Vatican to answer or evade.—His conclusions are perfectly sound."—*Patriot*.

"A work of remarkable originality, great research, powerful reasoning, and in various places, of a condensed nervous style which rises into eloquence. The force, necessity, and advantage of the coined words, are frequently apparent."—*Morning Advertiser*

"Poperly he attacks on all assailable points with very unquestionable spirit, very considerable skill, and abundant resource. He must be considered a good soldier in the faith: in the days of Cromwell he would have been inestimable He is a vigorous controversialist.

"The Grecian Dilemma and Pseudomenos set all philosophy at defiance, and remained to be solved by JOHN ROGERS."

Morning Herald.

"Poperly is examined and considered in all its features, bearings, and pretensions; and its dark and soul-destroying principles thoroughly exposed. There are many powerful, and even eloquent passages in the volume."—*Conservative Journal*.

"A literary curiosity.—It is in form and substance, the coinage of words, the style, and the ideas, about as singular a work as we ever saw. It displays so much learning and originality as to be well worthy the attention of the public."—*Lit. Gazette*.

"Mr. Rogers has entered at once manfully and energetically into the battle against Popery, dividing his attack, if we may so term it, into two chapters, viz. 'Popery in General' and 'Popery in Special.' In the first chapter, he has very ably given the character and general repulsive points of Popery; in the second, with singular power and industry, he has entered upon a searching analysis and confutation of its special abominations. We would refer to his chapters on 'Infallibility,' 'Transubstantiation,' and 'Idolatry,' as evincing great research

and acumen. Mr. Rogers seems enthusiastic in his labors, to which we wish all the success they seem so well calculated to command."—*Age*.

"We cannot withhold our admiration of the manner in which Mr. Rogers has denounced and scattered the baneful errors of Popery. His facts and his reasoning as to the asserted 'infallibility' of the Pope, the preposterous monstrosity of 'transubstantiation,' with the other manifold assumptions of papistry, are incontrovertible; indeed, of such a character, that we earnestly recommend them to universal perusal, truly believing that no tolerably intelligent Roman Catholic could soberly read them, and afterwards have faith in the monstrous doctrines which they are intended to refute."—*Argus*.

"This work is strikingly original. The thoughts are original, the argumentation is original, the style, construction, and phraseology are original. The *thinking* of the author breaks through all fetters or impediments, and powerfully illumines the dark mazes through which it is necessary for him, in pursuit of his object, to wander."—*Scottish Pilot*.

"The work consists of about 380 pages of as curious original matter as a man may find on a summer's day, and is studded all over with the most recondite expressions and choice fancies. Mr. Rogers is very decided in his arguments and opinions. He belabors the Pope and the *Popites* most unmercifully—reduces infallibility to a mere shadow—and makes minced meat of transubstantiation. Auricular confession is also thoroughly exposed, with all manner of *priestal* absolution and excommunication—and in short, Popery in general and Popery in special are not left with a leg to stand upon."—*Inverness Courier*.

"This work contains a great quantity of original thought, and is calculated to be useful in the war with Antichrist."

Inverness Herald.

"Among the many powerful and irresistible strokes which have recently fallen upon the head of 'the beast,' we know of

none that has been levelled with a surer aim, or with a more deadly effect, than in the volume before us. We consider it, in every respect, an entirely original and singular work. The author is evidently a man of very superior intellectual endowments, of a metaphysical and logical turn of mind, and accustomed to look much farther below the surface of things than the generality of writers. We think that his book is a heavy and destructive blow to the whole popish system; and one which must be severely, and we doubt not permanently felt. His language is forcible, and his arguments clear, cogent, and irrefragable. On each of the eighteen heads, the author's argument is forcible and triumphant. We have only to request that our readers will so far gratify themselves as to procure a copy of the book with as little delay as possible."

Sunderland Mirror.

"This work has a great deal of originality of thought and conception, and an admirable fund of new words, as well as new thoughts. . . . Its blows at Popery are dealt very heavily, and the protestant clergy as well as the laity will do well to possess themselves of this well-stored quiver from whence so many arrows against popery may be drawn."—*Nottingham Review.*

"This is an extraordinary work, the production of a vigorous thinker, who possesses the power of boldly setting forth and declaring his views. . . . The reasoning is powerful and christian, and the author, who is carried along in a fervid and enthusiastic spirit, occasionally gives us passages of eloquence as well as force."—*Western Times.*

"We cannot but offer our testimony to the zeal evinced by the author in the prosecution of his object, as well as to the ability and skill with which the subject is treated. . . . The arguments adduced against the tenets of Popery are both numerous and forcible, and the deductions logical. . . . The zeal and spirit of the work are highly commendable. The style is nervous and expressive, and the subjects and divisions lucidly classified. . . . It is a book of peculiar interest and value at

this moment. . . . It is one, moreover, that may advantage 'the Papist' something, (though it cannot please,) whilst it will be sure to obtain the approbation of the Protestant."

Shipping and Mercantile Gazette.

"A very original book. Mr. Rogers has brought to his task very considerable research and much logical reasoning. . . . Let him but remove these defects," [i. e. some defects of style, &c.] "and his writings will prove valuable to all the present age of religious controversy."—*Hertford Reformer.*

"*Antipopopriestian* is a work evincing very considerable research, and a thorough knowledge of the points in dispute among theologians. . . is devoted to a full and searching exposure of the errors of Popery. . . and will well repay the curious in such studies for an attentive perusal."—*Kent Herald.*

"Mr. Rogers has performed the task imposed on himself generally with clearness of reasoning and great force of language."—*Cambridge Chronicle.*

"This volume displays great judgment and elaborate research. We would recommend it to all who value sound religious controversy. The author's arguments are keen and sensible."

Northern Liberator.

"Mr. Rogers' arguments are logical and persuasive, exhibiting an originality and strength which prove them to be the product of a powerful mind. He has tested popery both by reason and revelation, and found it miserably wanting. He has tracked the Mystery of Iniquity to its hiding-place; and the verdict which any honest jury would give, after hearing his evidence, is that which he himself pronounces,—'*Popery is a cunning compound of superficial truth and solid error.*'"

Londonderry Sentinel.

THE INTRODUCTION.

I. To you who bear the christian name, and particularly to you who are christian in name and in nature, I more peculiarly submit the present work, hoping that you will judge kindly of my motive, candidly of my execution, and rightly of the result. What may be fitly done, regard with pleasure and approbation; and what may be defective, view with an indulgent and forgiving eye. And if your impartial reason decidedly disapprove, blame the head of the writer, rather than the heart.

I come before you with a degree of solicitude, and with a deep and solemn feeling of responsibility to God and man in relation to my work now laid before the world. Being my first work, I have an anxiety to know how it will be received by the reading public; and being on a very important subject, I am greatly concerned that it be found likely to promote the glory of God, and the temporal and eternal good of mankind. The literary name or fortune of the author, though important to him, is unimportant to the world; therefore on that point he will say no more. But the moral tendency of his work, the effect it may have on the present and future well-being of himself and other people, the character it has in relation to earth, and heaven, and hell, and according to the infinite wisdom of God,—this is a matter of another kind, and of grave concern, and whereon the writer ought to feel and does feel warmly interested and awfully accountable, and where-

on the reader ought to feel an interest lively and strong, both writer and reader being morally bound to care and desire that what is written and read may forward moral and natural good, and lead to holiness, and happiness, and heaven. May the present work aid in lessening the immorality and misery of man, in promoting purity, peace and joy upon earth, and in guiding many an immortal soul to glory and to God!

We live in an eventful and even alarming time. The whole world is in commotion; the world christian, Jewish, Mohammedan, and Pagan; religious, political, and social,—all are powerfully moved to and fro, and their peculiarities are being tried, and being retained unaltered, or reformed, or ruined, "men's hearts failing them for fear," Luke, 21 : 26; and the question being every where put, "Watchman, what of the night?" Isa. 21:11. The different schemes of polity current on the globe, are all undergoing an ordeal ample and severe, and are held or repelled as deemed utile or not, utility of a higher or a lower kind being taken for the standard. Of course, a very great amount of careful examination is bestowed on the subject of popery. A system acting with uncommon power on the fortune of many millions of mankind, ought to be rigidly examined and accurately known; and any system ought to be tested and tried in proportion to its effect on the condition of the world. All plans of polity being now on their trial, may the great and good Jehovah cause the bad to be removed, and the good to be confirmed and continued! God however works by the agency of man; and therefore man is bound to inquire in what way he can be most effectively an agent in carrying on the work of God. As a result of the inquiry in regard to myself, I write the present work, and come forward as a public opponent of what I deem public evil. I sincerely think that what is here opposed, forms a great evil; and that in opposing

it, I am keeping in the path of duty, and concurring with the Divine will. And may the all-wise God of love, who knows the sincerity of the writer, smile on him! and make the work a medium of good to many! crowning the writer and the reader with his heavenly approval, and blessing them now and for ever!

II. The word *Kirk* is employed in the present undertaking, instead of the word *Church*; for kirk is the better word of the two, being shorter, more musical, and more like the etymon. 1st. Kirk has only four letters, while church has six. 2nd. The term church is extremely dysphonical and harsh. The beginning and ending of the term church, are grating and unpleasant to our ear. 3rd. Kirk, or church, comes indirectly from the Greek κυρίου οίκος, *kurion oikos*, house of the Lord. Query. Ought the word to be written *Kurk*? The kurk of Scotland?

III. The word *priest* is often employed in the present work, to mean the christian minister or pastor. The word having a degree of ambiguity, and being capable of a meaning highly objectionable, I deem it right to give the following explanation. Priest may have a twofold meaning. 1st. Being probably a contraction of presbyter, it may mean the same thing, namely, elder, minister, preacher, pastor, or the like. 2nd. It may mean sacrificing priest, or sacrificer. The word priest taken in the latter meaning, that of sacrificer, is offensive and painful to the truly christian or truly protestant ear; and ought to be avoided as a fragment of papal corruption, and even of Judaism. Christianity knows no other sacrifice than the one great sacrifice of Christ, completed on the cross. She knows nothing of the pretended sacrifice of the mass, that huge fable of popery. The word priest, taken in the former meaning, that of presbyter or pastor, may be fitly employed in conversation, a speech a sermon or a book. The word is em-

ployed in the former signification, throughout my work, whether simply, as priest, or compoundly, as priesthood, priestal,* and the like.

IV. I indulge the hope that, in composing the work, I shall carefully avoid railing, angry terms, and bitter language. The foul epithet, bad name, scurrile phraseology, and personal invective, often found to come from pen and tongue, ought to be declined and shunned, for they do no good, and do great harm. The employment of them will foster bad feeling in the writer or speaker, affect with pain, and provoke to sin, the reader or hearer, make a good argument often appear a bad one, excite unduly the ire and sympathy of another in favor of the object of attack, set an evil example to the world, and condemn and contravene the plain declaration of Scripture, and the palpable dictate of reason. "The servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves. 2 Tim. 2. Speak evil of no man, be no brawlers, but gentle, showing al. meekness unto all men. Tit. 3:2. The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." James, 1:20.

It will not follow, however, that we are forbidden to write or speak boldly, decidedly, and in a manner not to be mistaken. We are quite justifiable in using a vigorous word, a strong style, and a mode of expression giving our full, entire, undoubted meaning, without favor and without fear. Our language is not required to be timid, luke-warm, feeble, and finical; deprived of energy, void of nerve, and destitute of spirit, edge, and point. "It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing. Gal. 4:18. Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their trans-

* The word *priestal*, comes regularly from priest, and is a proper adjective.

gression, and the house of Jacob their sins. Isaiah, 58 : 1. Rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith." Titus, 1 : 13.

I hope carefully to control my temper, and to be cool and cautious ; and yet to keep my ardor, and to be zealous and warm. Kind and gentle, yet decisive and firm ; pleading soberly, yet strongly ; having love for my opponent, but greater love for truth. Bishop Burnet wrote, " Whatever moderation or charity we may owe to men's persons, we owe none at all to their errors, and to that frame which is built on and supported by them." Soft word and hard argument—is undoubtedly a good rule ; but beware of going to the hurtful extreme ; and let not the softness of the former enfeeble and nullify the hardness of the latter. *Suaviter in modo, fortiter in re.*

V. Some may object that I employ too condemnatory language, write in a strain of undue severity, and betray too much of the spirit of carnal censure, and too little of that of christian love. They may object that the style is too cutting, and the spirit too severe ; and that popery, considering the moderate measure wherein it is held by enlightened men, is treated in a way somewhat harsh, sarcastic, and bitter.

I however beg the objector to bear in mind that my book is written not merely against moderate popery, popery deprived of its worse qualities, the system of enlightened, excellent, liberal men ; but also against full-grown and exclusive popery, popery in its most hideous form, popery as held by the bigot, the persecutor, and the mental slave. I attack with severity, not the popery of Fenelon, Pascal, and Gregory Lopez, but that of Hildebrand, Bonner, and bloody Mary ; not the popery that granted the edict of Nantes, but that which revoked it ; not the popery that, by going little beyond protestantism, and so by allowing the more of protestant operation, leads in a degree, to happiness here, and to salva-

tion hereafter, but that which, as a full-grown or merely carnal and prideful scheme, rides rough-shod over soul, body, and estate, and puts people into purgatory, in order to be *well paid* for putting them out. I write to oppose less popery as appearing in Great Britain, than popery as existing in Italy and Spain; less popery as held in check by the vicinity of the purer and more liberal spirit of protestantism, than popery as having the whole field to itself, and showing its corruption and illiberality aloof from the rebuke and counteraction of a better system. In brief, I delineate popery as it has been, as it is where its spirit and principle can work without control, and as it will be where and when able, while darkness shall be dark, cruelty cruel, and corruption corrupt.

Examples. "When we contemplate popery upheld by intolerating persecution and the infernal inquisition, &c." Chapter first, section 1, S. 2, A. 3. "So far as I understand the papal doctrine of merit, as exhibited in the prosperous and palmy days of popery, or as grown to the full, &c." Chapter 2, section 12. "What does the doctrine mean, when fully carried out, when taken in its whole extent, in its length, breadth, and depth?" Chapter second, section 14.

After giving the foregoing reason for not handling popery in a softer and gentler mode, I may surely add, that they whom I oppose have no good ground in the strong and uncompromising language employed, for throwing my book aside without perusal. Let them act as generous and manly opponents, not abusing my book, but using it; not flinging it away in a fit of ill nature, but frankly and honestly weighing its arguments and examining its value. May the work have fair play with friend and foe, being received with candor, and read with impartiality and a sincere desire to find and follow truth, even by the large party whom it is written to op-

pose! May the papal party, against whom the work is aimed, peruse it with care; may they "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest it!"

VI. Popery leads to Infidelity, being a very plentiful cause hereof; it tends to form, to foster, to harden infidels, and to encourage them to continue their desperate career. This is a painful thought, but not more painful than true, as will be made to appear.

Theory. When unconverted people see christianity mingled with the error, the superstition, the crime, the abomination of popery, of full-formed or perfect popery; see the rational and noble doctrines of the Bible joined to, and disfigured by the absurd and monstrous inventions of the "man of sin, the son of perdition;" 2 Thess. 2: 3, see the pure precept of the Gospel disregarded and forgotten amid the foul practice and corrupt doing of the papal kirk; see the holy and heavenly spirit of God's word, "swallowed up and lost" in the wide ocean of papal ignorance, vice, misery, of papal heresy and immorality, of papal fraud and hypocrisy, cruelty and satanical oppression, mammonism and extortion, lust and sensuality, anger, envy and malignity; see Jesus Christ compelled to appear in unnatural alliance with the Pope and the devil, the holy and benevolent Jesus having often appeared allied with a profane and profligate Pope and the deceiving and devouring devil; is it improbable, is it unnatural that the unconverted people will confound christianity with popery, and will oppose the former, in order effectively to expel the latter?

Practice. The papal world is full of infidels; popery, in the countries where she claims to reign supreme, is jostled and elbowed by infidelity; papal superstition and infidel devastation appear, in a large part of the christian world, to contend for an ignoble masterdom; and Italy, the unholy land of his holiness or unholiness

the pope, has been affirmed to contain more of the infidel tribe than any other nation in Europe.

Reader, think now of the fearful character of popery, and of its melancholy effect in the formation of the infidel. Whether we consult theory or practice, reasoning or fact, we find the result to be that popery is the forerunner of infidelity ; that papal perversion brings on infidel infatuation and impiety, or that Rome papal greatly tends to form the character, to confirm the hardihood, and therefore to augment the number of the miserable men termed infidels. Popery leads men to oppose christianity, and even to deem her untrue, unholy, and unhappy. Papal seed gives an infidel crop. In fine, popery draws men to doubt and reject revelation, and makes them run blindly, carelessly, desperately into that awful world where the doom of mankind will be either the happiness of heaven, or the misery of hell ! either joy inconceivable, or sorrow beyond compare !

With heavenly pleasure bless'd, or curs'd with hellish pain !
With angels gloried, or with devils dammed !

VII. Popery delays the conversion to christianity of Jew, Mohammedan, and Heathen. It does the thing in a two-fold way, by making christian less willing, worthy, and able to convey, and by making Jew, Mohammedan, and Heathen less willing to receive christianity.

The effect of popery on the christian as the conveyer of christianity. Because of the hurtful operation of the papal bad scheme among christian people, christian kirks and individuals make fewer and smaller efforts exclusively and purely to christianize the world, and to gather the Jewish, Mohammedan, and Heathen portions into the fold of Christ. Popery exerts a baneful and benumbing effect on the head, and heart, and hand of the christian world, lies heavily on the holy active energy

of christendom, and wofully impedes the truly missionary and evangelizing labor of worthy and pious people. Because of popery, there is less will and moral ability for the scriptural and saving conversion of Jew, Mohammedan, and Heathen; there being a smaller portion of people christian in nature, or a greater proportion christian in mere name. Moreover, because of popery, the comparatively few real christians have less natural ability for the real and rational conversion of Jew, Mohammedan, and Heathen, as will appear by the following three reasons. 1st. Real christians have less power and effect for good. 2nd. They have less time, being occupied in papal contention and debate. 3rd. They have less union.

The effect of popery on Jew, Mohammedan, and Heathen, as receivers of christianity. Popery, clouding the heavenly beauty of christianity, and hindering her beneficent and healing operation, makes Jew, Mohammedan and Heathen less inclined to receive her, less prone to take her for their place of refuge, safety, and comfort; for their guide through life, and their hope in death. The papal scheme will bring the three kinds of people to eye christianity with something like suspicion and unfavorable feeling; will lead them to doubt her Divine origin, to question the uncommon purity and holiness of her character, and to diffide in her great utility, her great power and operation in promoting peace, and happiness, and hope. 1st. When a contemplative and thoughtful Jew, Mohammedan, and Heathen ponder the great and heavy amount of papal absurdity and wrong, of papal evil moral and natural, under the christian name, will they be forward to view christianity as the immediate gift of God? They will not. 2nd. When they behold her as a mother of the papal bad scheme, a fountain-head of the sin and crime flowing from popery, will they be apt to regard her as the firmest friend and ally

of virtue ? They will not. 3rd. When they contemplate her as abounding in cruelty, oppression, persecution and war ; as being a fertile origin of suffering and misery, will they be ready to hail her as the best benefactress of mankind ? as the great spring of earthly and temporal joy, and of hope of joy beyond the grave, of pleasure heavenly and eternal ? as the main pillar, the real foundation, the very life-blood of human happiness both here and hereafter ? They will not. They will not be according to the 1st. the 2nd. or the 3rd. A Jew, Mohammedan, and Heathen will not easily perceive, will not readily and clearly know, and of course, will not take over great time and pain to inquire wherein christianity is superior to their own melancholy and miserable system, wherein she is more Divine, more holy, more beneficial. Therefore accusing her of evil not properly her own, blaming her instead of popery, the real blamable, to their own system they will cling, her (christianity) they will reject, God's message of mercy they will hear little, and heed less ; and instead of going to Jesus Christ, the Holy Ghost, holiness, happiness, hope, and heaven, will " lie down in sorrow, in darkness, and in the land of the shadow of death, having no hope, and without God in the world." Is. 50 : 11. Is. 9 : 2. Eph. 2 : 12.

By the foregoing, we learn the lamentable effect of popery in retarding the sound or solid conversion of Jew, Mohammedan, and Heathen. We see that it goes directly to darken and deaden the christian world ; throwing a thick cloud before the moral vision, and bringing a withering wind or poisonous vapor upon all the purer and better feeling and working of the heart. We see too that popery goes to uphold the power and continue the sway of Judaism, Mohammedism, and Heathenism. The papal system leads the Jew to reject the Messiah, the Mohammedan to repel the Justifier and

the Sanctifier, and the Heathen to repudiate the one true God, hindering the conversion of the three to the happy fold of Christ. N. B. Of course, by conversion, I mean real, rational, scriptural conversion; and not a mere nominal one, not a conversion that leaves the convert as unconverted in nature as afore, an *unconverted convert*. N. B. The Jews perhap have been kept from going to Christ, mainly by papal *Idolatry*.

VIII. I may say for myself that perhap I should never meddle with the papal system, by writing this work, if its evil nature and bad effect had no relation to, no connection with the world to come, eternal joy and sorrow. For what is the present world, compared with the world to come? A shadow. What is our life here, compared with our life elsewhere? A dream. What is our pleasure or pain now, compared with our pleasure or pain nowafter? A phantasy. What is the duration of all the generations of mankind upon earth, compared with eternity? A moment.

I oppose popery, and write my work, mainly and primarily on account of religion, for the good of christianity, to aid in saving the human soul commonly weighed down by sin and sorrow; to promote, in some poor way, the object near and dear to the heart of God, the everlasting happiness of his rational creation. I oppose popery, principally because it opposes the grand, the fundamental, the leading, the all-prevailing system of Jeho-

* I beg leave to coin the word *Nowafter*, it being a more correct one than hereafter. Nowafter and now, both refer to duration; but hereafter refers to duration, and here to expansion, here, when alone, having a meaning radically different from what it has when compounded with after. But the word *here* ought not to jump from expansion to duration, contravening logical order. We may coin a new word corresponding with here, as *hereaway*, *hereoffway*, or the like. Then we shall have the following correct arrangement: now, nowafter; here, hereaway, hereoffway, or the like.

vah, the system of good-will and love toward his creatures; of freeing them from pain, and filling them with pleasure through all time, and through all eternity. I begin, continue, and end the work, chiefly through a strong and lively conviction of the value of a soul; of the worth of an immortal mind; of the awful importance, in the eye of the Bible and of reason, of a spirit who will have existence rolling on through eternal duration, who will think, and feel, and be happy or miserable for ever and ever; and who, if happy after death, will probably go on increasing in happiness while eternity itself will remain.

Happy, happy are they who promote the salvation of souls, carefully, constantly, collectively; in every time, in every place, by every mean; from the press, in the pulpit, on the platform, in the parlor, and on their knees in private and public prayer to God!

Have gift and grace to thee been given?
Employ them to bring souls to heaven!

Heaven! How cheering and exhilarating is the thought of heaven!—particularly if we have a well-founded hope of going thither, if our heart be turned to heavenly things, if our soul be in a godly frame, or if we love God, *The Good Being*, Who makes heaven His throne. Isa 66:1. Reader, may you and I find our way to heaven!

Angelic, Godlike joy in heaven we'll prove,
Our head being full of light, our heart being full of love.

IX. Heaven apart, a more noble or delightful subject of contemplation can hardly be found, than the coming thousand years of holiness and happiness, called the Millennium. Think of the world as it has been in all time, and is now, and then think of it as it will be in the bright and beautiful day of millennial light and love,

and as it will begin to be ere very long, and what a flood of glory rolls on before the enraptured view of the mental eye! Amid the sin and sorrow now everywhere abounding, amid the iniquity and misery prevailing throughout, how pleasing the prospect of millennial purity and joy! how animating the thought that our globe will be occupied by hundreds of millions of people holy and happy! and how ennobling the consideration of our being instrumental in bringing forward the state so full of good to man, of gratification to angels, and of glory to God! But what a deal must be done, and what a deal must be undone afore that time can arrive! Many a thing now existing will be thrown down, and many a new one set up ere we see the swelling tide of millennial wisdom and virtue. In particular, ere the millennium will rise, popery will fall, the glory of the future day being incompatible with the mental dark and moral degradation of papal Rome. And I frankly avow that I the more readily and willingly take the field against Rome, and give manly battle to papal error, by knowing that in wielding my pen to help in overturning popery, I help in preparing the way for the millennium; or that in forwarding the ruin of the "man of sin," 2 Thess. 2:3, I promote the heavenly rule of the "Man that is the Fellow of the Lord of hosts." Zech. 13:7. O that the Lord may gladden, and convert, and save the world! turning the whole earth into one grand temple where he will be glorified, and man filled with life, and light, and love, and joy!

Oh what a change the world will prove!
A thousand years of peace and love!
God in the human heart will reign,
And heavenly glory dwell with men!

In writing here of the millennium at large, I do not commit myself to every opinion put forth by millena-

rians ; and in particular, I have no concern with, and do not enter into the question of what kind of reign Christ's will be, spiritual or personal, or of where his human nature will be, in heaven or on earth. I deem it enough for our good, and enough for holiness and happiness, that our Lord will reign and rule by his spirit in the hearts of his people, whether his humanity will be in heaven or Jerusalem. But without giving or professing to have a decided and well weighed opinion on the controverted question of where he will be, I beg leave to make three short remarks. 1st. The question appears to be of minor moment, and to have too little practical importance to deserve to occupy much of our time and thought. 2nd. It appears more noble, sublime and glorious for our Lord to be at God's right hand in heaven, than for him to be in a palace in Jerusalem. 3rd. The notion of the personal reign appears more or less to resemble the Jewish earthly notion of the temporal Messiah. To the three remarks, I will venture to add one humble request, namely, that people will write, and speak, and labor more in relation to where we shall be, in heaven or in hell, than in regard to where our Lord will be, in heaven or in Jerusalem.

X. I am a firm believer in christianity, and a professor of religion, and one who values above all earthly joy, the "pearl of great price," Matt. 13 : 46 ; the "wedding-garment," Matt. 22 ; the "one thing needful," Luke, 10 : 42 ; justification from guilt, and peace with God through Jesus Christ, and the sanctifying and comforting operations of the Holy Ghost, the well-founded hope of heaven. Therefore I have not, and cannot have identity of interest, community of feeling, oneness of object or unity of aim or design with infidel, sceptical and atheistical people either at home or abroad, whatever noise and clamor they may make about liberty civil or religious, and however hostile and opposed they may

be to slavery and tyranny. I do not give my heart, friendship, or company to men, merely and only because they happen to oppose temporal slavery. For alas! it is possible, and even quite easy and quite common to be at once a foe of slavery, and a slave of sin and Satan; to oppose despotism, without aiding piety; to love human liberty, without hating human folly and human crime; to be a fierce enemy of tyrannical rulers, and yet no friend of God. We have seen, and may now see active enemies of human tyrants, to be active enemies of religion, of man's main good, of God himself; to be firm allies of the devil, zealous and effective agents of hell.

"O my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united. Gen. 49:6. Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. Ps. 1:1. My son, if sinners entice thee, consent thou not. Walk not thou in the way with them, refrain thy foot from their path. Prov. 1:10, 15. Enter not into the path of the wicked, and go not in the way of evil men. Avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it, and pass away. Prov. 4:14, 15. Evil communications corrupt good manners. 1 Cor. 15:33. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. Gal. 5:9. Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." Eph 5:11.

XI. Great Britain and America have *Owenism*, France has *Simonianism*, Germany and other countries have an *ism* of similar kind. What is the nature or character of the several *isms*? Do they not imply infidelity? do they not appertain to scepticism? do they not lead to the dark and dreary shores of atheistic folly? The two forenamed *isms*, or schemes, and the like appear to me, so far as I know them, republications of old and exploded pestilent error, reproductions of what have been afore brought forward, examined, "weighed in the balances,

and found wanting." Dan. 5 : 27. The schemes appear to me unchristian and unphilosophical ; irreligious, immoral, and irrational. The infidel, sceptic, and atheist often pretend to be friends of virtue, while they are concealed and crafty allies of vice. Moreover, they often know very little about religion, while they fancy they know a very great deal. Their fancied knowledge often is mainly painted ignorance.

We have now in England and America a new thing, or an old thing under a new name, to wit, *Socialism*. If the thing be new, it is new by diving more deeply into evil than any former scheme has done ; and as to the name, it is remarkable not only by being new, but also by being a misnomer. Regarding the thing, it is notable privatively and positively, as to what it rejects, and what it receives. Among the things rejected, are *Property*, *Marriage*, and *Religion*,—three things blasphemously termed by the Socialists, *the trinity of evils*. Oh men trinally tried and bound to folly and to sin ! Of course they do not hold *Immortality*, that bright and blessed ground of hope for the future ! and do hold *Infidelity*, that dreary swamp of mere negation ! Among the things received, are *Fatalism*, and perhap *Atheism* ! Behold the Fatalist creed ! a miserable farrago of the wicked and the weak, a creed fit for none but a devil, a brute, or a fool ! Indeed Socialism appears a woful kind of compound of blasphemy and bestiality, or of *devilism* and *swinism*, and possibly began on that memorable day when the devils got into the swine. Matt. 8 : 32. Regarding the name, *Socialism* is by no mean to the point, the thing being about as unsocial as can well be imagined. The Socialism is doubly unsocial, dissociating man from man, and men from God. Instead of terming it *Socialism*, we shall be far nearer the mark in calling it *Sensualism*. Oh filthy dreamers ! Oh men full of the world, the flesh, and the devil ! how long

will ye wallow in sin and sensuality ? neglecting the soul ! despising God ! disregarding eternity ! turning away from heaven ! and tending toward hell ! that dark and dreadful gulf that yawns beneath ! that abode of misery and black despair !

Sinner, O why so thoughtless grown ?
 Why in such dreadful haste to die ?
 Daring to leap to worlds unknown !
 Heedless against thy God to fly !
 Wilt thou despise eternal fate,
 Urg'd on by sin's fantastic dreams ?
 Madly attempt th' infernal gate ?
 And force thy passage to the flames ?—*Unknown*.*

"This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. James, 3 : 15. Thy wisdom and thy knowledge, it hath perverted thee. Isa. 47 : 10. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. Col. 2 : 8. Avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called." 1 Tim. 6 : 20.

XII. I desire, heartily desire that the noble cause of liberty, both religious and civil, may have better and worthier advocates or champions than infidel, sceptical, and atheistical men ; than the holder and defender of the forementioned opinions, dangerous doctrine, crude conceit ; than the mad and miserable men, *antihuman* and *antidivine*, who " wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." 2 Tim. 3 : 13. " Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord." Isa. 52 : 11. " Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." 2 Tim. 2 : 19.

* The word *Unknown* put after lines, stands for *Author unknown*, i. e. unknown to me. Lines accompanied neither by the name of the author or work, nor by the word *Unknown*, are my own.

XIII. One of the most abominable and baneful doctrines ever sent into the world to corrupt and degrade it, one of the most depraving and disgusting proposals that ever sprang from a foul and filthy soul, one of the most indecent, immodest, impure tenets ever put forth by the slave of sensuality, is that of having wives or rather women in common. The scheme of community of wives or women, is perhap* the very master-piece of the great patron of sensual impurity, of Belial. This polluting principle, the principle of universal prostitution, makes a leading part, so far as I know, of the creed of Owenites, of Simonians, and of a like set of people in Germany. But the scheme of Belial will not do, and will not be adopted afore the Bible be burned; ere religion be sent back to heaven; afore the eye of reason be put out; ere philosophy be driven from the world; afore mankind be turned into brutes; ere men and women be brought down to the level of swine; afore good sense, fine feeling, chastity, delicacy, happy home, pure pleasure be banished from earth; ere folly, brutal appetite, fornication, coarseness, dismal and hated home, painted, plated, gilded misery be rendered universal. "But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate. So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate." Rev. 2: 6, 15.

Hail, wedded love! mysterious law, true source
Of human offspring, sole propriety
In Paradise of all things common else.
By thee adulterous Lust was driven from men
Among the bestial herds to range; by thee

* Why do people write *perhaps*, rather than *perhap*? *Perhap* is better in a threefold way. 1st. It is more like the origin, *per* and *hap*. 2nd. It has one letter less. 3rd. It is more musical. Now let the three good reasons overcome the bad custom. Or if the reader prefer old *perhaps*, let him not quarrel with new *perhap*.

Founded in reason, loyal, just, and pure,
 Relations dear, and all the charities
 Of father, son, and brother, first were known.

Par. Lost, B. IV.

O happy they ! the happiest of their kind !
 Whom gentler stars unite, and in one fate,
 Their hearts, their fortunes, and their beings blend.

Thomson.

Granting, for the sake of argument, that Belial will be able to set up the libidinous scheme, people will indulge in obscenity and lewd living, without restraint, without fear, without infamy, condemnation, and disgust ; they will give the rein to all the contemptible, low, vile, and to the furious or violent passions of the fallen and corrupt human heart ; they will take their full swing in every kind of sensuality, and in vice less carnal or material, rolling and wallowing in moral or immoral mire, " waxing worse and worse." 2 Tim. 3 : 13. If Belial should ever carry his favorite plan against Jesus Christ, (what he certainly never, never will do,) then we should see reason dethroned by passion, the soul overcome by the body, love supplanted by lust, virtue expelled by vice ; then we should see no virtuous affection, no wedded love, no husband, no wife, no beloved offspring ; then we should see the world become one boundless brothel, every man a lewdster, every woman a harlot, every child a bastard ; then we should see ignorance, and then vice of manifold kind and degree, cruelty, rage, revenge, bloodshed, murder, suicide, savagery, brutality, diabolicity overflow, overturn, overwhelm every thing good, pure, noble in the human heart, defile, deform, destroy the human creation of God, expunge our globe from the map of morality, and give to hell, a lewd triumph over heaven.

" God sitteth upon the throne of his holiness. Psalm 47 : 8. Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, who was,

and is, and is to come. Rev. 4:8. Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. Isa. 6:3. For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, Whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones. Isa. 57:15. Holiness to the Lord. Exod. 28:36. and 39:30. Zech. 14:20. As He who hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation. Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy. 1 Peter, 1:15, 16. Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. Heb. 12:14. Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God. 2 Cor. 7:1. The grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world. Titus, 2:11, 12. Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God. Matt. 5:8. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Exod. 20:14. The man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbor's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death. Lev. 20:10. Deut. 22:22. For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. Matt. 19:5, 6. To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband. 1 Cor. 7:2. Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers, God will judge. Heb. 13:4. Be not deceived: not fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers,

nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. Flee fornication. 1 Cor. 6. The works of the flesh are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness—they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Gal. 5: 19, 21. Fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints; for this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Eph. 5: 3, 5. For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revellings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries: wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you: who shall give account to Him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. 1 Peter, 4: 3-5. The fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." Rev. 21: 8.

XIV. A wise, virtuous, and holy man finds a delightful amplitude of meaning in the word *wife*, taking the word in a sense high and favorable, and implying what some wives are, and what all ought to aim to be. His wife is the sharer of all his sorrow, and of all his joy; the lessener of his pain, and the augments of his pleasure; the partaker of his care, and the refiner of his recreation; his nurse and consoler when ill, his compeer and coadjutor when well, his associate and helper continually; the companion, the counsellor, the comfort of his life. She is one whom he regards with reverence for her profound piety, with admiration for

her fine improved intellect, with kindness for her sweet temper, with grateful satisfaction for her noble character in general.

To her he will unbosom his thought, and lay open his whole soul, with most entire confidence; to her firstly in time, she being the first in order of his friends, he will reveal his theory and practical plan, his present cheme and future view, his desire, hope, and fear; and from her he will obtain the counsel, encouragement, and aid that are given by virtue, wisdom, good temper, and other things, all acting unitedly or as one, and moving at the call of love. She will study to please him; will gratify him by her obliging behavior; will make him happy, and herself too, by her mild and gentle spirit, her complying disposition, her amiable turn of mind; will bind his soul to hers by accommodating herself to him, and by making his joy and sorrow her own; will maintain her refining power and purifying ascendent over him by the beauty of her character, the dignity of her life, and by yielding to his reasonable request, and giving way to his innocent wish and plan; will turn by a kind word, a sweet smile, an endearing look, a tender tear, turn the lion into the lamb; will control, virtually and really control by being willing to be controlled.

She is one whom he loves with exclusive, with tender, with chaste, with pure affection; one who lives in the very centre of his heart, one dear to him like his own soul, one who is another himself. She loves not less than she is loved, will return his affection in full measure, will scorn to be outdone in kind attention and tender care, and will find a pure and perennial spring of joy to her own soul, in making joyful the soul of her husband.

Between them are no jarring or contrary feeling, no separate interest or view, no counteractive scheme, no *mine* and *thine*; between them all is *our*, all is concord-

ant co-operation, all is living harmony, all is pleasurable unanimity, all is endearing unity of soul. They are one in outward things or external good, one in hand; one in intellectual communion, one in head; and one in the vast variety of feeling, in the broad and unbounded domain of joy and sorrow; one in heart, having entire sympathy, or identified interest, affection and hope.

One single soul doth in two bodies dwell.

They cause, one to the other, many, very many pleasures; and they occasion one pain—the pain connected with parting, with being divided by death, with one of them being left alone, mournful, soul-sick, inconsolate, and gloomy. But even in relation to death, and for its uncontrollable conqueror and king, they see God, *The Good Being*, and their reconciled Father and Friend. To the Good Being they bow, in him they confide, and through him they are, or try to be, resigned. Moreover, having a hope full of immortality, they look beyond death to heaven, to the joy and glory of the life to come, when death will be swallowed up in victory, when God will wipe away all tears from their eyes, and when sorrow or pain will not be found. Is. 25:8. 1 Cor. 15:54. Rev. 7:17, and 21:4. In heaven they will be re-united for ever; there they will meet to part no more; there, in the beatific presence of their God, and with innumerable saints and angels, they together will share and rejoice in God's eternity.

Death! 'tis a melancholy day
To those that have no God!—*Watts.*

She will be his affectionate co-pilgrim through the world of sin, his faithful fellow-traveller in the way of holy love and labor, his watchful and helpful guide to glory. And probably she will be his guardian angel or saint, if she shall die before him; will be his peculiar partner in heaven, his dearest friend among all the saints

and angels around the throne of God ; and allied with him by an extraordinary heavenly affection, will ascend with him to higher degrees of light and love, becoming more and more happy in God, throughout the revolving ages of eternity.

"Let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself." Eph. 5 : 33. "Heirs together of the grace of life." 1 Pet. 3 : 7.

XV. I do not desire to appear to the reader better than I really am ; I do not incline to put myself forward, or before the eye of other people, as having more religion and religious zeal than I actually have. I have written, in article X, that "I am a firm believer in christianity, and a professor of religion, and one who values above all earthly joy, the 'pearl of great price,' Matt. 13 : 46, the 'wedding-garment,' Matt. 22, the 'one thing needful,' Luke, 10 : 42, justification from guilt, and peace with God through Jesus Christ, and the sanctifying and comforting operations of the Holy Ghost, the well-founded hope of heaven."

But I do not profess to abound in religion, to have uncommon piety, or to be an extremely holy man ; and I hope that no part of my work will be found to imply so great a profession. I have a share of piety, but not a great one ; a small quantity of religion, not a great deal. I do love God ; but alas ! little, languidly, coolly, and timidly ; in a manner infinitely below the goodness and amability of his character ; in a manner forming a poor and beggarly return, a paltry and contemptible degree of gratitude for the creative, providential, and redemptional favors that I have received from his bounty ; and therefore in a manner that does not deserve, that cannot merit his continued love to me. "God is love." 1 John, 4. "What is man ?" Psalm 8.

Dear Lord ! and shall we ever live
At this poor dying rate ?

Our love so faint, so cold to thee,
And thine to us so great!—Watts, B. 2. H. 34.

I do love the soul and eternal good of mankind ; but not with a burning and absorbing desire, not with a heart overflowing with sympathy or compassion, nor with a feeling duly organized and attuned by the refining, ennobling hand of consummate charity or universal love. Holy love has length, and breadth, and depth, the extremity whereof I have not arrived at or advened. Holy love, and light, and life, extend to a remoter point than I have hitherto gained, expand to a wider circumference than I have yet gone round or over, ascend to a higher altitude than I have attained, and have, in the loftier degree of human experience, an intensity, a thrilling ecstasy, and a power far beyond any thing that I have hitherto felt and experimentally known. I am a very frail christian, am a poor weak worm creeping slowly and scarce perceptibly after Christ, and enjoy but a feeble measure of assurance. But I do not despair of being better. I hope and believe that I shall be better, more imbued with love for God, and with love for the creature ; shall be more holy, more happy, more fully assured that my soul is safe or going on to glory.

Whether or not *christian perfection* is attainable, practicable, enjoyable in life, I give here no decided, positive, formal opinion. It is certainly a beautiful and holy doctrine, and one that I incline to hold. I however am far from perfection. But I will try to be perfect ; and if I fail herein, hope to be far less imperfect than I am. "I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." Phil. 3 : 12.

Happy soul, when all renewed
God in thee, and thou in God !
Only feel'st within thee move,
Tenderness, compassion, love !
Love immense and unconfined,
Love to all of human kind,

Love that willeth all should live,
 Love that all to all would give,
 Love that over all prevails,
 Love that never, never fails.
 Stand secure, for thou shalt prove
 All th' eternity of Love !—*Unknown.*

Every encouragement is given to grow in grace, to become more and more sanctified and holy, to proceed farther and farther in the life divine, to have more and more of the mind of Christ Jesus, Phil. 2 : 5, our Lord, Redeemer, and Pattern, our Priest, Prophet, and King. If we need to encourage ourselves, we may amply do so by the following three delightful words,—“God is love.”

I hope I shall not offend my readers by telling them, in passing, that I mean to take for my personal motto the following six words of the Bible,—“*God is love. What is man?*”

If any one be in want of a motto, I beg leave to recommend the following two short passages, as being, when joined in one, a motto very admirable. “*What is truth? God's word is truth.*” John, 18 : 38, and 17 : 17. Though not a son of song, I have humbly endeavored to form thereon a morsel of poetry. It may lead some one to do better. I shall be truly glad to see the thing finely and fully poetized by an able poetic pen.

“What is truth?”—blind Pilate cried.
 “God's word is truth,”—did Christ decide.
 Haughty sinners seek the truth in vain,
 And rove in error's cold and dark domain;
 Godly christians find the truth is plain,
 And freely own her holy, happy reign.

The former part of the present article was written more than a year ago ; and it correctly describes my then state or condition relative to personal piety, or real, practical, experimental religion. Since writing the former part, however, I have made a move forth in vital

piety, have gone forward in the Divine life, and am nearer to the Lord now than I was then. I now love God and human kind more than I did, being more anxious for the glory of the former and the salvation of the latter. Blessed be the Lord for the onward movement, however small! From him it came, and to him be the praise. Would that I were far more like God than I am! Would that I loved him and his creatures far better than I do! Moreover, I now more fully and firmly believe the great and glorious doctrine of christian perfection, or entire sanctification of heart and life.

Holy God, regard my prayer :
Give me perfect purity here ;
All renew'd by the Spirit let me be :
Bid sin from thought, word, act, e'en now to flee.

ANTI-POPERY.

CHAPTER FIRST.

POPERY IN GENERAL.

Section 1. An account of Popery.—2. Works against Popery.—3. Two divisions of Christendom.—4. Papal unity and plurality.—5. Papite and Patriarchite.—6. Neither Catholic nor Roman Catholic, but Papite, Romanite, and the like.—7. Worthy Papites.—8. Popery at war with Reason, the Bible, and Antiquity.—9. A condemnation, and the time of Popery, are found in the Bible.

SECTION I.

AN ACCOUNT OF POPERY.

Subsection I. I venture to remark that among the mental and moral desiderata of the present day, we may rank a work against Popery. The work appears desirable because of the error and evil of popery, and because of the chance that decrease of popery may be followed by corresponding increase of infidelity. Popery prepares the way for infidelity, being her handmaid. Infidelity has been called "*Popery run to seed.*" Where popery loses ground, is the vacant place filled by protestantism, or by infidelity? by a reformed religion, or by no religion at all? This is an important and solemn inquiry with all who are alive to the eternal, or even to the temporal welfare of man. Popery is bad, infidelity

ty is worse ; the former corrupting religion, the latter destroying her.

A good work against popery will give no aid to infidelity ; for in freeing christianity from papal innovation, corruption, usurpation, and fraud, it will enable her beauty and splendor to appear more fully, more clearly, more convincingly, hereby leaving infidelity without palliation or a plea. It follows that the downfall of popery will by no mean infer the downfall of christianity, the unholy triumph of the infidel. In passing from popery to protestantism, christianity appears like the sun when breaking a way through vapor, cloud, and gloom, gradually giving fuller, purer, steadier light.

Subsection II. Article 1. Popery is unchristian and unphilosophical, unscriptural and unreasonable, a foe to the Bible, and a foe to logic and knowledge. Popery will imprison revelation, and put an extinguisher on reason ; and then lead her votary blinded and enslaved. Popery is opposed to moral and to mental eminence ; to the march of morality, and to the march of mind. Popery is an anti-christian form of christianity, an impious innovation on the Bible, a pernicious perversion of Holy Writ. Popery is not *apostolical*, but *apostatical*. Popery is overrun by absurdity, superstition, and idolatry. Popery is a consummation of corruption. Popery goes to unchristianize christendom, depriving christianity of life or spirit, and turning it into a lifeless lump, or a cold, inanimate thing, attended with idle formality, and accompanied by priestly power and presumption. Popery tends to slavery, the more sad and hopeless kind of slavery, slavery of body, and slavery of soul ; therefore, he who is a real, complete, whole, thick and thin papite, is little or no better than a slave, a low, contemptible, miserable slave. That wise and good man, Richard Cecil, wrote,—“Popery was the master-piece of Satan.”

Article 2. Bigotry and illiberality reign in the papal

kirk ; cruelty and intolerance form her natural element, her favorite logic ; the infernal inquisition is her grand argument.

1st. Her bigotry and illiberality are proved by her monopolizing dogma of exclusive salvation, salvation within her pale, and only there. According to her presumption, all christians dying without her pale, however christian and good in character, however holy or godly, are doomed to damnation ! are accursed in the present world, and will be damned in the world to come ! Dreadful and diabolical dogma ! How opposite the doctrine of the word of God ! " Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Eph. 6 : 24. Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons ; but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. Acts, 10 : 34, 35. He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life. John, 3 : 36. He that hath the Son, hath life. . 1 John, 5 : 12. He is not a Jew, who is one outwardly ; but he is a Jew, who is one inwardly." Rom. 2 : 28, 29. The papal notion of exclusive salvation, is apt, very apt to lead people to depend more on external conformity than on internal conversion ; to rely more on papal kirk-membership, than on real christian character ; and to be more anxious for belonging to the kirk of Rome, than for being adopted into the kirk of Christ and the family of heaven.

2nd. The cruelty and intolerance of the papal kirk are proved by her prodigious persecution, her wicked wars, her horrid bloodshed, her massacre and murder.

3rd. Her infernal inquisition, the diabolical invention of Dominic, is too well known to need any remark from me. Spain and Portugal, and their foreign dependencies, Italy, and other parts of papal Europe, can bear witness with groaning, and agony, and blood, against that cursed engine of hell, that machine invented by de-

mons, and worked by demonized men. The learned and pious John Pye Smith declares the infernal inquisition to be "the most horrible tribunal that ever trampled on justice and human nature."*

Article 3. Really, when we contemplate popery upheld by intolerating persecution and the infernal inquisition, or when, guided by the light of history, we consider it under the character of a mighty monster intolerantly persecutive and infernally *inquisitional*, we view not a thing that has a mark of the light and love of heaven, but one black and hateful as hell, and cruel as a conclave of devils; one belched from the burning pit, and giving dreadful proof of its infernal origin; one whereof the head or soul is not the merciful Redeemer, the Lord of love, but the leading devil himself, Satan, the great enemy of God and man, aided by Moloch on the one hand, and by Mammon and Belial on the other. When we regard popery as prevailing by persecution, and the pope as the prince of persecutors, we are drawn to exclaim,—Let Satan be figured on the three parts, and let Moloch, Mammon, and Belial be figured each on one part of the triple crown of the pope, of the viceregal diadem of Satan's viceroy!

Article 4. Papal persecutions are declared to be the most prominent in history, both in nature and in number. They are perhaps the most varied, multiform, atrocious, infernal, diabolical; and they are undoubtedly the most numerous and manifold. Millions, many millions, some declare that *fifty*† millions, and some declare that even nearly *seventy*‡ millions have gone to the grave through

* See the Doctor's admirable Sermon intitled—"The Reasons of the Protestant Religion," a sermon well worthy of general perusal, being *multum in parvo*.

† See Buck's 'Theological Dictionary by Henderson, article Persecution.

‡ See Spragues' Lectures on Religion, Lecture V.

papal persecution! The soil of the greater part of Europe has been drenched with the blood of martyrs; blood spilled by the papal monster, really to attain his own infernal ends, though professedly (a profession implying all the hypocrisy of devils!) to uphold the religion of the God of love! Papal persecutions are clearly foretold, and powerfully drawn by the prophetic pen of John. "I saw the woman *drunken* with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. 17: 6.

Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;
E'en them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones,
Forget not; in thy book record their groans,
Who were thy sheep, and in their ancient fold
Slain by the bloody Piedmontese who rolled
Mother with infant down the rocks. Their moans
The vales redoubled to the hills, and they
To heaven. Their martyr'd blood and ashes sow
O'er all the Italian fields where still doth sway
The triple tyrant; that from these may grow
A hundred fold who, having learned thy way,
Early may fly the Babylonian wo.—*Milton.*

Article 5. Popery has largely dealt in fraud and force in guile and cruelty. Popery has carried the point by cunning wile or smooth-tongued hypocrisy, when able; and when unable to carry it hereby, has had full and horrible recourse to the dungeon and the infernal inquisition, to the sword, the torture, and the burning pile. In breaking faith and playing false, the kirk of Rome profanely pretended to promote the dominion of truth! and in massacring, burning, and otherwise destroying men, women and children, it wickedly and absurdly pretended to serve and glorify the God of love! But to the Roman or papal kirk one may say, "Lie not for the truth!" (or rather, for power, pelf, and the like!) "and kill not

men for the sake of God!" (or rather, of mammon!)

Subsection III. A great deal of popery is will worship, vain invention of man, crude conceit and imagining some-deal systemized, an aggregate having no solid warranty, no foundation, no support either in revelation or in reason. Now will worship and arrogant invention are exceedingly bad in the domain of religion, and therefore ought to be repelled whenever proposed. In the beginning, they are inutile, are not good; and in the end, they are hurtful, antichristian, bad in a high degree. They being of very evil character and tendency, deserve to be thrown aside as unworthy of regard, as a real object of sincere and hearty reprobation. They are proud and presumptuous, endeavoring to improve God's order; an order that He has given, not to parade our skill in the vain and overweening attempt of mending, but to employ our energy in the utile pursuit of following, so that we may live and die holy and happy. To conceit ourselves capable of improving God's good and perfect arrangement, is to deem ourselves wiser, holier, better than God! Popery abounds in things that came not by God's command, and that bring not God's smile and blessing. Do not they bring His frown and curse?

"Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind; and not holding the Head. Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh. Col. 2. Who hath required this at your hand? Bring no more vain oblations. They are a trouble unto Me; I am weary to bear them. Isa. 1. In vain they do worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. Matt. 15 : 9; Mark, 7 : 7. Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth." Titus, 1 : 14.

Subsection IV. Popery is popery, and is to be uprooted whenever, wherever, and however it appears to our eye. Popery is popery, whether nakedly exposed in all its deformity, or partly concealed in apparel termed *protestant*; and it is often the more dangerous by being disguised, as a snake hid in the grass may do more harm than one apparent on the beaten path. Popery is popery in the papal kirk, or in any other; in Italy, or in Great Britain; in Rome, or in Oxford; in the pope, or in Pusey, Newman, Froude, and Co. Query. Are not these men and the like, if not decidedly papal, the pioneers of popery? and are not they endeavoring to bring a dark papal cloud athwart our clear and bright protestant firmament, by circulating the Oxford Tracts, or rather Oxford *Trash*? They are men to whom I cannot say, "God speed," 2 John, 10, 11, but to whom I rather say, "The Lord rebuke you." Jude, 9; Zech. 3:2.

SECTION II.

WORKS AGAINST POPERY.

Subsection I. We have many an able work against popery; but perhap not one of that varied, universal, high, commanding character demanded by our day, and by the magnitude of the interest involved in the debate. A work is required that will wind along throughout all papal countries, that will be read by all papal readers, that will incite inquiry in all papal thinkers, that will command attention and examination from all literary men in all nations of the christian world.

Subsection II. Indeed it may be a query if three works be not required: one containing clear, powerful, original,

first-rate reasoning; one containing great and irresistible eloquence; and one containing vast and prodigious learning, particularly in theology and history; and all three containing pure, fervent, elevated piety.

Subsection III. One work containing the four requisites, the reasoning, eloquence, learning and piety, would be a work of such uncommon character and value, and so truly unequalled, as to be an object of desire rather than of expectation. The author of the masterly, complete, incomparable work, will be a kind of miracle, and will be found when Locke, Milton, Selden, and Leighton will re-appear, and be formed into one man. I opine that no one will ever be able to write the work, and sure I am that no one now alive is equal to the great undertaking.

Subsection IV. I have here made an effort to meet a part of the demand, and have heartily wielded my pen to promote the well-being of scriptural christianity and pure protestantism. And in aiding the protestant cause, I have tried reasoning more than eloquence or learning; or have endeavored to show that popery cannot stand upon clear, strong, and solid argument, more than to write with a fascinating flow of style, or more than to go into theological, historical, and lingual particularity or detail. May the reader receive the work with generous impartiality and christian candor, and not magnify defect, nor put a harsh construction where a kind one is practicable!

Subsection V. As an equal in eloquence to Bossuet, a living name that would appear to many to be qualified for an able advocate of the protestant plan, is a great orator of Scotland, Chalmers. Two of the leading papal champions are Bellarmine and Bossuet, and one leading protestant champion is Chillingworth. And if the great orator of Scotland were to enter the field, we should then oppose to the celebrated names of Bellarmine and

Bossuet, the names no less renowned, of Chillingworth and Chalmers.*

SECTION III.

THE DIVISIONS OF CHRISTENDOM.

Subsection I. Christendom sometime is divided into three grand kirks; kirk Patriarchal, kirk Papal, kirk Protestant. The division, however, is not remarkably accurate, clear, or free from ambiguity. We may well speak of kirk Greek, Patriarchal, or Constantinoplan, and of Kirk Latin, Papal, or Roman, the two being single or individual. But we may not speak of kirk Protestant, as if it were single or individual, as if all protestants formed but one kirk. Kirk Protestant is a term universal, a term including many particular kirks. When therefore kirk Protestant is opposed to kirk Greek, Patriarchal, or Constantinoplan, or to kirk Latin, Papal or Roman, a term universal is opposed to a term particular, many kirks are opposed to one.

Subsection II. But though Christendom has not been very accurately divisible into three grand kirks, it has been properly divisible into three grand parts; that holding Patriarchy, that holding Popery, that holding Protestancy. The head of that part holding Patriarchy, is the Patriarch of Constantinople; the head of that part holding Popery, is the Pope of Rome; the head of that

* And it would be wrong to omit the name of the venerable EDGER, of Armagh, Ireland; who has given us one of the most learned works of our age, in reply to Bossuet's *Variations of Protestantism*. We allude to Edger's admirable and unanswerable work, entitled "*The Variations of Popery*," which has passed to a second edition in London.—W. C. B.

part holding Protestancy, is Jesus Christ. "The head over all things to the church. Eph. 1:22. Who is the head, even Christ. Eph. 4:15. He is the head of the body, the church." Col. 1:18.

SECTION IV.

PAPAL UNITY AND PLURALITY.

Subsection I. Papists are continually talking of the identity of creed among them, and of the diversity of creed among protestants. It is true that protestants are more divided in point of kirk; it is not true that they are more divided in point of creed. Papites form but one kirk, while protestants form many; herein therefore the latter are more various and multiform than the former.

Subsection II. In point of creed, however, papites and protestants, other things being equal, are about equally diversified; though papal writers lead an ignorant and careless reader to believe that papites enjoy the advantage of uniformity of opinion, while protestants endure the disadvantage of multiformity. This papal mode of writing is unfair, is an uncandid trick. Both bodies are well known to differ in opinion among themselves, and, other things being equal, in an equal degree; therefore papal pretension to uniformity of creed, is hypocritical farce and folly. The real point at issue, the proper subject of debate is the comparative degree or amount of multiformity; for by deciding this point or subject, we shall know if papites have smaller multiformity than protestants. A papite will find it no trifling task to prove their doctrinal diversity smaller than our own. Be it known that protestancy requires fewer creeds than kirks, or

not a peculiar creed for every kirk; many kirks, in point of fact, having one and the same creed. As to uniformity of opinion, the assertion of it is ridiculous and absurd, the claim to it is founded on nonsense and folly, the inexistence of it is proved by clear, palpable, indubitable fact. The notion of "Unity of Opinion," is a mere papal whim, vagary, phantasm, ignisfatuus. The assumption of unity of opinion, is a mere anility or puerility, an act of an old woman or a child, or a piece of fraud; is a mere offspring of folly, or of falsehood, or of both.

Firstly. Let us view protestants taken collectively, taken under the collective term kirk. Papal writers will hardly pretend that their kirk has smaller multiformity of opinion than any single kirk protestant, they will hardly presume that one kirk protestant can be found having greater multiformity of opinion than their own kirk. They ought to know that every protestant kirk has power and ability for attaining real and true uniformity of opinion, equally to the papal one; all kirks being, in this affair, on the same footing, on equal terms. The notion of diversity of doctrine or variety of creed, is not contained in the notion of kirk protestant single, more than in the notion of kirk papal; the latter being as diverse or various in doctrine or creed, as any one kirk protestant. Papal writers will not venture to affirm that the notion of kirk protestant individual, implies the notion of diversity of doctrine and contrariety of creed, contains the notion of difference of opinion and belief, more than does the notion of kirk papal. Literate men know well that, peculiarly and exclusively, one does not connect the notion of particular protestant kirk or body, with the notion of variety and contrariety of creed. No kirk protestant can be fairly and truly described to be a scene of contrariety and confusion of creed or faith, to be without discipline and order, to be without means of promoting real and true uniformity of opinion or har

mony of doctrine, and due conformity of conduct. The description would be caricature, would be wrong in point of fact. N. B. Kirks protestant do not deem ignorance and Insincerity to be uniformity of opinion, and do not deem Intolerance to be capable of promoting it

Secondly. Protestants taken singly or individually, are not more multiform and divided in opinion than papites taken singularly or individually, two things being provided. 1st. Provided that papites are as enlightened and informed as protestants. 2nd. Provided that papites declare and make known their opinion as fairly and fully as protestants.

1st. Well informed protestants will probably differ in opinion more than ill-informed papites; intellectual protestancy will probably produce greater variety of opinion, doctrine, and creed in the many and varied modes of mental exertion, than unintellectual popery. Absence of opinion however is not uniformity of opinion, mental vacuity is not union of doctrine, mere ignorance differs widely from identity of creed. *Ignorance* is not uniformity of opinion.

2nd. Protestants enjoy the privilege of declaring, telling, publishing their opinion under cover either of equality or of toleration; while papites do not enjoy either equality or toleration. Ask Italy, Spain, and other papal countries, if persecution, if intolerance, if the infernal inquisition do not form a leading cause of doctrinal agreement. If few really and truly believed in papal peculiarities, many would profess to do so while seeing, like Damocles, a sword hanging over them. Concealment of opinion, however, is not uniformity of opinion; keeping one's peculiar view in one's own bosom, is not being without a peculiar view; uniformity in profession and external ceremony, is not uniformity in doctrine and belief; secrecy of conviction, is not sameness of creed. *Insincerity* is not uniformity of opinion.

SECTION V.

PAPITE AND PATRIARCHITE.

Subsection I. It ought to be borne in mind that papites, or Romanites, have no better reason for claiming uniformity either in creed or in kirk, than patriarchites or Constantinoplanites; each sect arrogating to have but one creed, and having but one kirk. Therefore, whatever honor belongs to papites or Romanites, because of their unreal, imagined, dreamed uniformity in creed, or because of their real uniformity in kirk, belongs equally to patriarchites or Constantinoplanites.

Subsection II. Do the two bodies, and particularly do papites derive any honor from the nature of their unity of kirk? No; their kind of unity being dishonorable instead of honorable, being a ground of condemnation rather than of praise. Protestants deserve to be honored, applauded, copied for avoiding the like unity. If they had but one similar kirk, and particularly a kirk like the papal one, they would have, more or less, a large, unwieldy, overgrown bulk, fertile in vice and folly; a huge, heterogeneous, heretical system; a big and bloated body covered with corruption, a body without a soul; a kind of moral or immoral monster. Such wholly or mainly is the kirk papal, and such it has long been, to the great degradation of Christianity, and the grave dishonor of Christ. A kirk containing many millions of people, and comprising many countries and nations, and kept together by priestly rule, by kingly despotism, by political authority, by the magisterial sword, cannot be wholly christian and scriptural, cannot be otherwise than unchristian and unscriptural. I will end with a query:—the papal unity being very bad, what is the patriarchal? is it good?

SECTION VI.

NEITHER CATHOLIC NOR ROMAN CATHOLIC, BUT
PAPITE, ROMANITE, AND THE LIKE.

Subsection I. In the present work, I do not employ the term *Catholic* or *Roman Catholic*, but write *Papist* or *Papite*, *Romanist* or *Romanite*, and the like. In so writing, however, I am far, very far from intending or wishing to hurt the feeling, or pain the mind of any member of the kirk of Rome; but I intend to follow a plan scriptural and reasonable, and to write with grammatical and philosophical propriety. I desire not to be, and not to appear to be offensive or insulting; but to be orderly, or to be conform to method and rule. I desire not to give displeasure or pain, but to have definitude or precision. I aim to be accurate or correct, and to employ words in their right and true meaning. I avoid using Catholic and Roman Catholic, on five grounds; in order to be analogical, in order to be logical, in order to oppose papal bigotry, in order to oppose papal pride, and in order to oppose papal persecution.

First. Analogical. We employ the terms popery, papism, Romanism, and the like; therefore we may well have papist or papite, Romanist or Romanite, and the like. Popery, papism, and Romanism being proper, popite,* papite, Romanite, or the like are proper too.

Second. Logical. Catholic means universal or general, but universality or generality is very far from belonging to the kirk of Rome. If that kirk were universal or general, it would properly be called, not the kirk of Rome, but the kirk. Therefore it is not catholic, or has not catholicity. To limit and narrow the meaning, people use Roman catholic; but they may about as well

* *Popite* is new, but not less correct than pope or popery.

use *particular, universal, or special, general*, a phraseology clearly incorrect and absurd. That kirk cannot be, in one and same meaning and relation, both particular and universal, both special and general. Being the former, it cannot be the latter. Therefore it cannot be, in one and same point of view, both Roman and catholic. In brief, universal or general being wrong when applied to the kirk of Rome, and particular universal, or special general being wrong and contradictory, either catholic or Roman catholic cannot be right, cannot be logically right.

Third. Opposing papal bigotry. If Romanites fancy the kirk of Rome to be catholic or all-containing, they unavoidably fancy all other kirks to be no real or right kirks at all, unkirking them, and denying their distinct ecclesiastical reality or rectitude. Assuming their own kirk to be catholic or universal, papites assume every other kirk to be merely a nominal one, or to have not the ecclesiastical thing, but only the name; and hereby they feed their own bigotry, and confirm their illiberal view and feeling. By having the name catholic or general, they are apt to presume that they have the thing catholicity or generality; and therefore they presume that the papal kirk is the only real and proper one in christendom; and that every other is a mere thing of nought, or a vain and wrong pretender. Through their imaginary catholicism, they are unjust toward other kirks, doing them the injury of denying their essentially ecclesiastical character, or of deeming them devoid of solid, reasonable, scriptural ground. In fine, their pretended catholicity confirms their bigotry, making them narrow in their mind, narrow and exclusive in their heart, and narrow and repulsive in their acting. N. B. The Romanite would take Roman catholic to mean catholic.

Fourth. Opposing papal pride. Do not the members of the kirk of Rome, or many of them, pride them-

selves on the title catholic, and arrogate to their kirk, on the strength and merit of their pretended catholicism, a superiority to every other kirk? They do. If Romanites imagine the kirk of Rome to be catholic or universal either in fact or in right, either *de facto* or *de jure*, they imagine it to be an incomparable one, an ecclesiastical nonpareil; and therefore they are liable to imagine themselves incomparable, and to be led away by inordinate self-esteem. If papites take the papal kirk to be catholic or general either in fact or in right, they are tempted to be proud, and often tempted effectively. In fine, the name catholic is apt to lead them to think of themselves, as an ecclesiastical body, more highly than they ought to think. Rom. 12:3. N. B. The Romanite would take Roman catholic to mean catholic.

Fifth. Opposing papal persecution. If papites imagine their kirk to be catholic or universal in right or *de jure*, they are prone to infer that protestants and the like who are not actually within her pale, ought to be there; and to infer that, if they get the power, they may compel all christendom to follow their catholic kirk, and to submit to her or their ecclesiastical rule. If Romanites deem the kirk of Rome catholic or general in right or *de jure*, they are apt to conclude that it has, or that they have a right to rule all christian people, and to control and compel all who are baptized. Building on their pretended catholicity, they are liable to conceit themselves a kind of ecclesiastical lords, and to fancy that their will ought to be the law; therefore they are tempted, and often effectively tempted to be persecutive, to let loose the devil of persecution, and to persecute all who are out of their kirk. N. B. The Romanite would take Roman catholic to mean catholic.

Subsection II. The words papist and Romanist are unmusical and grating to our ear; therefore let them

give way to *papite* and *Romanite*, words of a sound musical and agreeable. I know no good and adequate reason for retaining the unwelcome sound of *ist*, where we may have the melody of *ite*.

In our authorized translation of the Bible, commonly deemed a noble standard of our noble language, we find not Israelist, Edomist, Moabist, Ammonist, Canaanist, and so on, but Israelite, Edomite, Moabite, Ammonite, Canaanite, and the like. Moreover, we find Elijah the Tishbite, Ephron the Hittite, Ittai the Gittite, Barzillai the Gileadite, Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite, Zophar the Naamathite, and more of the kind. Therefore let none blame me for making harsh *ist* give way to euphonical *ite*.

SECTION VII.

WORTHY PAPITES.

I hope no worthy papite will be offended by the freedom of my remarks. I see great difference between papites. The name of Fenelon, Pascal, and Malebranche, is loved and gratefully remembered equally with that of Taylor, Boyle, and Berkeley.* And the protestant public hold in everlasting honor the name of the very holy people, very eminent saints, Gregory Lopez, Molinos, Lady Guion, De Renty, Thomas a Kempis, and the like.† Though I hate papism, I love the good papist. Great

* Yet these men celebrated mass, and bowed down before the wafer god, and professed all the essential peculiarities of the man of sin!—W. C. B.

† These have some good things occasionally, especially Kempis. But those acquainted with their writings, cannot acquit them of Quietism, and immeasurable fanaticism.—W. C. B.

and good people have been, and are within the visible and exterior pale of the papal kirk; but they are papal more in name than in nature. Though within the visible and exterior circle of that kirk, they partake not of her spirit; for they acknowledge and lament her manifold abomination, they admit and bewail her error and her crime. Moreover, when speaking, in strong terms and with ample condemnation, of the papal priesthood, I speak not of the excellent individual, but of the body at large; not of the honorable exception, but of the rule. Some papal clergymen have done honor to humanity, but they have been papal more in name than in nature. Why good men remain in the guilty and corrupt communion of the papal kirk, sanctioning, by their presence, evil that they condemn, but cannot prevent; why they do not leave her for a better and purer plan; why they do not forsake her, and hereby avoid every degree and kind of participation in her error, her vice, and her punishment;—is indeed a solemn and awful question, one claiming their present, very earnest, and careful consideration and regard. For their conduct therein, their conduct in belonging to the corrupt kirk of Rome, they will and must answer, and give a full account to their conscience and to God. "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. 18:4.*

SECTION VIII.

POPERY AT WAR WITH REASON, THE BIBLE, AND ANTIQUITY.

Subsection I. Popery is contravened and condemned alike by the human understanding, by the word of God,

* See the Introduction, article 5.

and by the pure primitive kirk ; being contrary to reason, opposite to the Bible, and adverse to antiquity ; being irrational, antibiblical, and merely modern. And in a corresponding threefold way, popery may be, and ought to be examined, opposed, and held up to public view as an evil thing. The protestant advocate ought to show that popery cannot stand the test of clear and solid reasoning, cannot abide the searching and probing spirit or even language of Holy Writ, and cannot endure the weight of disproof given it by pure christian antiquity, speaking through the historic page, and the work of the christian father.

Subsection II. My work however treats popery mainly in the first way, showing more its irrationality and principally proving it to be inconsistent and at war with good sense and logical wisdom. But though the opposition of popery to Scripture is not here mainly exhibited, it is far from being forgotten, but is shown in a considerable degree ; and moreover, the papal opposition to antiquity will be more or less unveiled. I handle popery in a manner having trinal gradation, or three degrees : primarily, according to reason ; secondarily, according to Scripture ; and tertiarily, according to antiquity. (See section II. Subsection IV.) In the following or last section of the present or first chapter, I will briefly point out the leading Scripture passages that condemn popery ; and in section last of chapter second, I will curtly prove, by a short historical account, that popery is a novelty, and has gradually arisen or grown up since the primitive and pure time of christianity, not only since the apostolic age, but even since the memorable union of kirk and state by Constantine.

SECTION IX.

A CONDEMNATION AND THE TIME OF POPERY, ARE
FOUND IN THE BIBLE.

Subsection I. Of the places in the Bible that refer to the papal kirk I will here mention the following. 1 Tim. 4: 1-3. The man of sin or son of perdition of Paul. 2 Thess. 2: 3-12. The little horn of Daniel, 7: 8, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26. The second or twohorned* beast of John, Rev. 13: 11, which probably is what is called *the false prophet* in 16: 13; 19: 20; and 20: 10. The whore of Babylon. Rev. 17. The foregoing passages relate to popery, and particularly to the papal priesthood. The four notable characters, the little horn of Daniel, the man of sin or son of perdition of Paul, the twohorned beast or false prophet of John, and the whore of Babylon, are all taken to mean the corrupt and rotten kirk of Babylon Rome, or rather the pope and papal priesthood.

Firstly. The second or twohorned beast meaning the papal priesthood, what does the first or tenhorned beast mean? The tenhorned beast means popery in general; and the twohorned beast means popery in particular, or the papal priesthood. Or the tenhorned one means the power political, and the twohorned one means the power ecclesiastical. See Rev. 13: 1, 11. *Secondly.* That the first or tenhorned beast means not Rome Pagan, but Rome Papal, will be clear by the consideration of the following three reasons. 1st. John saw it rise up out of the sea, and therefore it was to come; but Rome Pagan had risen or come long afore. 2nd. It had ten horns or kingdoms, which Rome Pagan never had. 3rd.

* The two horns of the second beast represent the two kinds of papal priesthood, the secular and regular.

"Power was given unto him to continue forty and two months," that is, 1,260 years. Rev. 13: 5.

Subsection II. Probably the Antichrist of John, and perhaps the blaspheming king of Daniel, 11: 36, mean popery, popery in particular. They may mean other things in a secondary kind of way, or taken generally. For example: Antichrist may mean Mohammedism, Infidelity, and the like; and the blaspheming king may mean the corruption of the Greek church, infidelity, and the like. But primarily, mainly, peculiarly, they mean the unreasonable and unscriptural kirk of Babylon Rome; antichrist probably, and the blaspheming king possibly being popery in particular, or the papal priesthood, and therefore being identical with the little horn, the man of sin, the twohorned beast, and the whore of Babylon.

Firstly. Concerning Antichrist, the council of Gap in 1603, formally identified him with the pope. I will quote two periods from the Encyclopedia Britannica, article Antichrist. "The point having been maturely debated at the council of Gap, held in 1603, a resolution was taken thereupon to insert an article in the Confession of Faith, whereby the pope is formally declared to be Antichrist.—Pope Clement VIII. was stung to the quick with this decision; and even king Henry IV. of France was not a little mortified to be thus declared, as he said, an imp of Antichrist." *Secondly.* Our renowned countryman, the famous Roger Bacon, entertained no favorable notion of the christian character of the pope; for that great genius and good man thought the pope to be antichrist, deemed his holiness supereminently unholy and antichristian, and found the leading earthly enemy of Christ and the kirk, to be the pretended universal bishop.

I remark that in relation to Antichrist and the blaspheming king, we meet not few difficulties, and some that I am not enough a Scripturian and historian to de-

termine. A great deal of minute or circumstantial knowledge, Biblical, historical, and lingual, is required for the determination of questions relating to the foregoing two and other like points; and my line of pursuit is not there. To decide the points fully and finally, is not an easy affair for any one, reasons being found pro and con; therefore I leave the decision to writers who make the interpretation of Prophecy their main and peculiar department. And may the great and good God, the Lord of love, by the overruling providence without, and by the Holy Spirit within, guide my readers and myself in the way of doctrinal truth, and of practical rectitude and purity! Amen.

Subsection III. Divine Revelation declares the duration of popery to be 1260 years. Six or seven passages concur in ascertaining the time. "A time, and times, and the dividing of time. Dan. 7 : 25. A time, times, and a half. Dan. 12 : 7.* A time, and times, and half a time. Rev. 12 : 14. Forty and two months. Rev. 11 : 2, and 13 : 5. A thousand, two hundred, and threescore days." Rev. 11 : 3, and 12 : 6. Now a time, times, and half a time are one year, two years, and half a year, or $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, years prophetic. And the old Jewish year had 12 months, each month of 30 days; therefore it had 360 days. And adding together the three separate sums, we obtain the following sum total :

A time or one year	360 days.
Times or two years	720 ———
Half a time, or half a year . .	180 ———
	—————
Total	1260 days.

Moreover, 42 months of 30 days each, contain 1,260 days. It follows that the three kinds of expression,—

* Does the passage in Dan. 12 : 7. refer to Popery ? or does it relate to Mohammedism, &c. ?

a thousand, two hundred, and threescore days,—mean severally the same period, 1260 days. Now in prophetic language, a day is put for a year, day and year being identical. Numb. 14 : 34 ; Ezek. 4 : 6 ; Dan. 9 : 24. It follows that 1260 days are 1260 years. By the foregoing, we find the duration of popery to be 1260 years.

Though the foregoing six or seven passages prove the duration of popery to be 1260 years, two other passages make mention of two other periods, namely, 1290 and 1335 days or years. Dan. 12 : 11, 12. To the great number of 1260, a small number is added, namely, 30 or 75, the two latter differing to 45. Probably the plagues or things that will overturn Popery, Mohammedism, &c. will begin at the end of the 1260 years, and continue till the end of the 1290, or during 30 years. From the 1290th year to the 1335th, or during the period of 45 years, things will be getting settled ; peace, liberty, knowledge, holiness, and happiness will be gaining ground ; the kingdom of heaven and of God will be taking root upon earth ; and the way will be cleared for the march of the millennial glory, by the end of the 1335 years, when Christ will begin to reign fully upon earth, and when the Spirit will begin to dwell in the heart of mankind in general.

Knowing the duration of popery, if we know when it began, we know when it will end. Commentators in general deem popery to have begun either when the pope became the universal bishop, or when he became a temporal prince. The former view appears the better. Therefore we date popery from the year 606 A. D. when pope Boniface III. was declared, by Phocas the emperor of Constantinople, to be the *Universal Bishop*. According to our view and date, the 1260, 1290, and 1335 years will terminate in A. D. 1866, 1896, 1941.

We do well to remember that Boniface was declared the universal bishop, not by Jesus Christ, nor even by

Peter or any other inspired man, but by Phocas, a vile, wicked, and infernal monster, or rather an incarnate devil. Therefore the origin of the proud title is not divine, but rather diabolical.

CHAPTER SECOND.

POPERY IN SPECIAL.

SECTION I.

THE SPECIES.

In order to give the reader one comprehensive and clear view of the many subjects that will be singly brought under our consideration, I will here mention the parts whereinto popery will be divided, putting them down in the special order wherein they will be handled. I divide popery into, and examine it under eighteen parts or heads, making every part an independent section. N. B. Popery is here taken in an exclusive meaning, or as confined to the matters that it contains in addition to Biblical Christianity, or over and above pure Protestantism.

1st. Papal Primaty.*

2d. Infallibility.

* I write *Primaty*, and *Suprematy*; not *Supremacy*, and *primacy*. *Suprematy* and *primaty* are more musical, and more etymological; and therefore doubly better.

- 3d. Vulgate, Apocrypha, Tradition.
 - 4th. Knowledge a proscribed thing, and the Bible a forbidden book.
 - 5th. Unknown Tongue, or Latin the general language of popery.
 - 6th. Transubstantiation.
 - 7th. The Sacrifice of the Mass.
 - 8th. The Worship of the Host.
 - 9th. Half Communion, or no Cup to the Laity.
 - 10th. Idolatry.
 - 11th. Merit.
 - 12th. Purgatory, and praying for the Dead.
 - 13th. Priestal Absolution and Excommunication.
 - 14th. Auricular Confession.
 - 15th. Celibate of the Clergy.
 - 16th. The Seven Sacraments.
 - 17th. Priestal Intention.
 - 18th. Superstition.
 - 19th. Blasphemy.
-

SECTION II.

THE PRIMACY OF THE POPE.

Subsection I. In treating of the primacy or supremacy of the pope, I confine myself to the ecclesiastical primacy or spiritual supremacy, to the claim of the pope to rule the kirk, or to be her sovereign head, the primal or supreme, according to the following papal boast, "Peter and the pontiff possess the plenitude of power." I keep to the ecclesiastical part of the question, on the follow-

ing twofold account. 1st. The political primaty or secular supremacy of the pope, is a doctrine so peculiarly and preposterously absurd, as not to deserve a formal refutation here. Its uncommon monstrosity renders it comparatively impotent for evil, counteracting the poison, and blunting the sting. 2nd. Many popites, a majority of them, do not allow the pope's primaty political, do not admit his claim to meddle in political or secular affairs, and will not permit him to domineer over the temporal doing of the nations, or to order the course and guide the wheel of civil government. Both papal individuals and papal nations, private persons and the government, deem the pope an injurious intruder on the political arena, and judge the deposing and dispensing power, and other temporal power claimed by the pope, to be hurtful to the state, contrary to reason, and opposite to the current of Holy Writ.

Subsection II. In order to prove their favorite and fundamental doctrine of the primaty or supreme power of the pope, papal folk affirm, in plain terms or by implication, the following three things. 1st. That Peter was the prince of the apostles, having had a great prerogative peculiar to himself or superior to theirs, namely, the primaty. 2nd. That Peter's princedom or primaty descended after him to all time. 3rd. That Peter's primaty or supreme spiritual power has descended to and through the Roman bishops, he having been peculiarly bishop of Rome.

I have here to make three remarks. Remark 1st. The tremendous power implied in papal or rather *popan* supremacy, and the overwhelming burden hereby laid on the whole christian world, justify our demanding from Rome, proof clear, and solid, and strong; or argument convincing like philosophical or moral certainty, or like mathematical demonstration, or like supernatural evidence and light. *The apostolic princedom of Peter,*

the descent of his pryncedom or primaty, and the descent of it through Rome, are three things that must be proved beyond all doubt, must be made as clear as the unclouded sun at noonday, must be upheld by an evidential power sufficient to content the reason; and to carry the mind of carefully inquiring christendom. Very great power being here claimed by Rome, very great proof must be given to substantiate the claim; for in proportion to the magnitude of the privilege sought for popery, must be the evidence offered by the papal champion. They who may lose greatly, may require great proof; and they who try to gain much, ought to be ready to give much argument. The primaty of the pope is a fundamental of popery; therefore let it be proved fundamentally, firmly, fully. Geometry is built on her postulates and axioms, and Philosophy is founded on clear and solid principles; while Astrology fares better with imagination than with reason, and Alchemy prefers the occult to the open, the dawn to the day. Now let popery resemble the former two, and not the latter. Let it clothe itself with geometrical certainty or philosophic clearness, and not shrink behind the lunacy of the astrologer or the dream of the alchemite. Remark 2nd. The foregoing three things must be proved, every one of them must be proved to be true, or the papal scheme falls; for if only one be wrong, the scheme cannot be right. If any one of the three links of the papal chain be broken, the chain is broken; and then it cannot drag along the weight of spiritual supremacy. Remark 3rd. The foregoing three things can be disproved, every one of them can be shown to be wrong; and therefore the papal scheme is not only wrong, but wrong to a three-fold degree, or wrong trinally. Oh thrice broken chain! all the three links being broken!

Subsection III. Article 1. Affirmation first. "Peter was the prince of the apostles, having had a great pre-

rogative peculiar to himself or superior to theirs, namely, the primaty." Now this I deny, flatly and fully deny, and will go on to show the utter want of proof, the utter want of rational and Biblical argument.

Article 2. To show that Peter was not a prince or head over the other apostles, I will give ten proofs.

Proof 1st. Peter, in his two Epistles, claims no supremacy, giving not one hint in either of them, that he was supreme. Instead of calling himself *the ruler*, he calls himself "*an elder*." 1 Pet. 5: 1. Surely if he were the supreme head, he would give some intimation of it in his writing. But Peter was not the pope, and did not assume what was not his due.

Proof 2nd. Scripture affords not one real example of Peter's primaty over the other apostles. He nowhere exerts the mastery over them, and they nowhere treat him as being their spiritual master. In no time and no place, did Peter act as the apostolic head, or show himself supreme over his colleagues; and in no time and no place, did they act as his inferiors, or concede to him the pretended supremacy. Neither did he actively, nor did they passively give ground for concluding that he was authorized to command, and they bound to obey. And that Peter had the primaty over the apostolic band, and yet that he and they never made it appear, never let it be known, he never ordering, and they never submitting, is a marvel of marvels, is indeed a miracle, is a wonder of the world. "The other apostles acted so well as not to afford Peter an opportunity for exerting his supreme power in correcting them." Oh the rogues! They unluckily behaved so well as to make Peter's primaty a sinecure! and to keep from the Romanites a knock-down argument! Pity that the apostles were not popes! poor Peter would then have work enough to keep them in order!

Proof 3rd. All were alike called by Christ, and

all were alike commissioned by Christ. Matt. 10 : 1, and 28 : 19. The power of binding and loosing was given equally to all the apostles. Matt. 18 : 18. John, 20 : 22, 23. "*Priestal Absolution*," A. 5, may now be read again.

Proof 4th. "It shall not be so among you. Matt 20 : 26. One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. 23 : 8. They had disputed among themselves, who should be the greatest. Mark, 11 : 34 ; Matt. 18 : 1. I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas. 1 Cor. 1 : 12. First, apostles. 1 Cor. 12 : 28. Some, apostles. Eph. 4 : 11. The foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone. Eph. 2 : 20. The names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." Rev. 21 : 14. Now do not these passages disprove the notion of Peter's primacy ? do not they prove that the apostles were on an equality ? or do not they show that Peter's fancied principedom over his colleagues was quite unknown to him and to them ? They do.

Proof 5th. Peter was called to account by others. "They that were of the circumcision *contended* with him." Acts, 11 : 2. What ! contend with the supreme head of the kirk ? contend with their master ? contend with their ecclesiastical king ? No, no. Away with the figment of Peter's supreme power !

Proof 6th. The apostles *sent* Peter and John. Acts, 8 : 14. Truly if Peter were the prince of the apostles he would not be sent by them. The master is not sent by his servants, the ruler by the ruled.

Proof 7th. It is certain that Peter was not superior to Paul, was not the head over him. Paul declares himself to be "not a whit behind, in nothing behind, the very chiefest apostles." 2 Cor. 11 : 5, and 12 : 11. Paul publicly *rebuked* or *reproved* Peter. Gal. 2 : 11-14. Now who do not see that, if Peter were the primal or su

preme, Paul would be greatly behind him, and would not presume to take him to task for his fault?

Proof 8th. James appears more like the prince or head than Peter. "He (Christ) was seen of James. 1 Cor. 15:7. Paul went in with us unto James. Acts, 21:18. James, Cephas, and John." Gal. 2:9. James took the lead in the great council of Jerusalem; for he clearly presided, and he gave the decision, pronouncing the definitive sentence, or dictating the decree. Acts, 15. If James were not head over Peter, Peter certainly was not head over James. James, or neither.

Proof 9th. John appears to have a better right than Peter to the title of the prince of the apostles, as Barrow and others have remarked. I will give six reasons. 1st. John did not deny the Lord. 2nd. John asked Him a question that Peter durst not ask. See John, chapter thirteenth. 3rd. John was the beloved disciple. 4th. John had the Virgin Mary confided to his care. 5th. John outlived all the apostles. 6th. John wrote more than any one of the twelve, and far more than Peter, and so did greater good to the christian world.

Proof 10th. If Peter were supreme over the other apostles in authority, he would very probably be superior to them in mental endowment, in miraculous power, or in holy attainment. But he was not their superior. In regard to mental endowment natural and acquired, he was not superior to Paul, nor to James, nor to John, nor to Matthew, nor probably to every other, and he was clearly inferior to Paul; in relation to miraculous power, he was not superior to Paul; and as to holy attainment, he was not superior to John, nor to Paul, nor to James, (called *the Just*,) nor probably to all the others, and he was perhaps inferior to John. Therefore we may fairly infer that Peter was not the supreme.

Article 3. Having given ten proofs in opposition to the principedom or primaty of Peter, I will go on to con-

consider the evidence brought by the party of Rome We will examine three objections.

Objection 1st. Peter often spoke first, and his name is often put first, of the twelve. Reply. Firstly. Peter often spoke first, or often was the spokesman or *spoke-man* of the twelve, because probably of his warm temper and natural zeal, or of his early call, or of his age. He appears to have been an ardent, active, ready man, forward to speak and forward to act, and sometime too forward. He appears confident, self-confident; and his self-confidence or presuming turn led him too often into fault, led him once to *rebuke* the Lord, and afterward to *deny* Him. Matt. 16:22, and 26:72. Secondly. Peter's name is often put first, probably either because he was the first to speak or the spokeman, or because he was the first or one of the first called by our Lord to the apostolate. How far the order of naming resulted from age, I will not affirm.

Objection 2nd. Peter received the power of the keys, the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Matt. 16:19. Reply. Peter had the honor of first preaching, or opening the door of the Gospel to Jews and Gentiles; to the former, on the day of Pentecost, and to the latter, in the case of Cornelius. Peter turned the key, and unlocked the Gospel door. But this work implied mere priority, priority in time; but no primaty, no suprematy, no superiority in rank or power.

Objection 3rd. "Upon this rock I will build my church." Matt. 16:18. Now the church being built on Peter, Peter must be the supreme head of the church. Reply. Upon *Πετρα* the *rock* confessed, upon the confession that Peter made, upon "the Christ, the Son of the living God;" and not upon *Πετρος*; or Peter the *stone* or *piece of rock* confessing, not upon the confessor, not upon Peter the man. Upon the rock of a noble and divine truth, and not upon the sand of a frail human crea-

ture; upon Jesus Christ himself, and not upon poor Peter, a weak, ignorant and sinful worm. Peter said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Our Lord replied, Upon this rock, or truth; this truth, firm as a rock, I will build my church. To prove our view to be correct, I will give five reasons. Reason 1st. common sense utterly repudiates the papal view, and upholds our own. Common sense or right reason cannot allow that our Lord built his church on a mere man, built it on ignorance, frailty, and sin; or built it on something no more able to support the burden, than a tortoise would be to carry the world. Common sense or right reason cannot admit that Christ built on a rotten foundation, built on the shifting sand of human infirmity, or built a thing that must tumble down. Christ did not build a cathedral on a cabbage-stump. Reason 2d. Parallel passages prove our point. "This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Acts, 4:11; Matt. 21:42; Ps. 118:22. Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner-stone—the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence. 1 Pet. 2:6, 7, 8. The foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. Eph. 2:20. They drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ. 1. Cor. 10:4. Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock. Matt. 7:24. Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone. Isa. 28:16. Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 3:11. N. B. In Scripture, the Lord is often signified by the term *rock*. Reason 3d. The original words oppose the papal whim, and show our view to be the right one. *Πετρος*, *Petrus*, or Peter is in

the masculine gender, and means, *a stone or piece of rock*—*a stone or piece of rock*; while *Πετρα* or *Petra* is in the feminine gender, and means *rock*. "Thou art Peter," (*Πετρος* or *Petrus*,) "and upon this rock," (*Πετρα* or *Petra*,) "I will build my church." "Thou art *Πετρος*, and upon this *Πετρα*, I will build, &c." "Thou art a *stone*, and upon this *rock* I will build." Our Lord therefore did not build upon *Πετρος*; (a stone;) but He took occasion from the meaning of the word *Πετρος* or Peter, (a stone or piece of rock,) to refer to Himself as *The Rock*, and perhap significantly pointing his finger to himself at the same time. N. B. The apostle, having been aforenamed Cephas, (a stone,) John, 1:42, perhap to denote his strength or hardihood of character, is now, after nobly confessing Jesus to be "the Christ, the Son of the living God," named *Πετρος*, (a stone,) in allusion to the strength and stability of the truth confessed, and also perhap to his own hardy character. Reason 4th. Our interpretation of this noted passage of Matthew, was given by many of the early Fathers. It was given by Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Nazianzen, and several more; and probably by Origen and Tertullian. Reason 5th. Our interpretation has been given by many Romanites, by *four or five popes*, by the venerable Bede, Anselm, and several more.

Subsection IV. Affirmation second. "Peter's principdom or primaty decended after him to all time." Now this papal affirmation I deny, flatly and fully deny; and I proceed to show it to be quite unsupported by solid or convincing proof, or to be unproved and unprovable. Even if Peter were (but he was not) the supreme, the suprematy was a mere personal distinction, and therefore did not and could not descend to any after him. If with Peter it lived, with Peter it died. One death took them both away, and one tomb holds them together. As Peter's shadow went with him, so went his supre-

maty,—into the other world. It might be enough here to say that Romanites cannot prove their affirmation, cannot prove it certainly or probably, cannot prove it at all. They affirm, and they can do no more. And to their mere affirmation we might be content, as to bare logical requirement, with giving a mere denial. Our nay equals their yea. But we will not be content with remarking that they cannot prove, for we will go on to disprove. To show that Peter's primaty did not descend after him, I will give four arguments.

Argument. 2. If the supreme power be claimed by any one, it will probably be claimed by or for some bishop; but the claim displays a daring degree of presumption and pride. The bishop of Rome, an uninspired man, and often an unconverted one, a man peccable and fallible, and too often immoral and ignorant, has no kind of title to the uncommon power of an inspired apostle. And the bishop of any other place, has no kind of title to the power. The modern pretension to the power, by the pope or by any other man, is impudent and profane, is a huge monstrosity. Supposing a weak, ignorant, and sinful man to be the supreme head of all Christendom, the primal or absolute ruler of the whole christian world, the guide and lord of every member of every christian country, dictating what must be believed, and commanding what must be done, directing every head and every hand,—is supposing a moral impossibility, supposing in opposition to reason and the Bible, or supposing in a way that would lead a jury of angels to deem the supposer a fool, and to send him to the Limbo of Vanity! How far an angel or an inspired and miraculous man might wield the universal suprematy, I will not presume to decide; but a mere uninspired and unmiraculous man might as well attempt to wield the moon. To what precise point the apostolic power extended, I do not exactly know; but whatever the full

power was, it is not found in our day. The apostolic office died with the apostles, the supremacy (if any) died with the supreme, it being personal only. If supremacy lived with Peter, it was crucified with him, and with its head downward, so that it died as certainly as he. Peace to its ghost!

Argument 2nd. That the primacy does not descend to our day, may be inferred from our utter want of information concerning the legitimate line of descent. How do we know the real and rightful successor to Peter? how can we clearly ascertain which of two or more claimants, is in the direct line from the apostle? how can we tell whether the reigning man is the *primal* or a pretender? Does the apparent supreme derive from the lineal successor to Peter, or from the party authorized to elect? or does he derive from his own usurpation, or from a usurper or usurping party? The reigning man may be the first to break through the lawful line, or may follow an individual or a party who had broken through; he may be the first or the second link of a new and counterfeit chain. What sure test or criterion have we for distinguishing the right from a wrong, the real light from an *ignis fatuus*? No sure or certain one. By what rule can we clearly determine the *direct succession*? By no rule. What clew or direction is given in Scripture, for knowing the true line of descent, or the veritable descendent of Peter? None at all. On this great point Scripture leaves one quite in the dark. Ample direction was given for knowing the high-priest and any other priest under the Jewish economy. They were of the tribe of Levi, and the family of Aaron; and therefore were easily known or distinguishable from members of the other eleven tribes, and from the other Levites. Moreover, the New Testament gives direction about christian ministers, who and what they are, their character, qualification, and the like. Paul writes much

about bishops and deacons, and what they ought to be, and how they may be known; and other parts of the New Testament afford similar information. But nowhere in Holy Writ do we find anything about ascertaining the Supreme Head! We are not told who he is, or what, or where; we are not told how to find him out, or how to discern him from every or any other. We have no scripture rule for knowing the Supreme from a subordinate, the head from a member. Men talk and write about the identity of the body, and the identity of the soul, and the puzzling questions connected therewith; but the most puzzling kind of identity, is the identity of the supreme head of all christendom. However much we puzzle our brain here, we shall puzzle in vain; for we shall find no identity, but diversity enough. Having therefore no information or no rule to guide us in tracking the line of descent of the primaty, or in discovering where or in whom the primaty is lodged, we may fairly infer that it is not lodged any where on earth, that it is not the property of any living mortal, that it is not found out of Christ. Not knowing where or in whom to find it here below, we are certain that here it cannot be found.

Argument 3rd. That the primity does not descend to our day, may be inferred from the utter silence of Scripture in regard to it in any way, in regard to its descent abstractedly, or in regard even to its existence. Not only are we not told in whom it is, but we are not told that it is at all. We are not told any thing about the primaty, are not told that it descends any where, are not told that it is in being. Even if it lived in Peter, we read nothing of its living now; therefore we may conclude that, even if it were formerly alive, it is now dead and gone—never to return. Scripture nowhere makes mention either of the line of descent of the primaty, or of its descent at all, of its bare being; nowhere declares

in whom it shall be after Peter, or that it shall be in any one; nowhere even alludes thereto. In the Revelation, where it would properly and very probably be spoken of if existing, it is not spoken of at all, John not alluding to it in any way. Surely the silence of John concerning the primacy, is remarkable, and proves the papal figment not to be existing, and not to be intended by the Lord for the kirk. John gave a kind of prophetic history of the kirk, but yet wrote not one word on the supreme power pretendedly committed by Christ to a mere man. Surely the silence of the apostle ought to silence the pope, and ought to make him and all reject the notion of supreme power being put in a feeble, ignorant, and sinful man.

Argument 4th. That the primacy has not descended, may be inferred not only from what Scripture does not say, but even from what it does say, coupled with what it does not. In arguments 2nd and 3rd, we have seen that Scripture gives no direction for knowing its true line of descent, and gives no intimation that it does descend; not telling that it descends here or there, and not telling that it descends any where. In arguments second and third, I wrote of a proper or pure primacy, of one agreeable to the Divine will, one derived from the Lord Himself; and concerning that primacy, I said that Scripture is silent. But concerning another kind of primacy, Scripture is not silent, speaking of it often, and in a pretty plain way. There is the primacy of the little horn of Daniel, or of the man of sin or son of perdition of Paul, or of the two-horned beast, or of the whore of Babylon, or in other words, of corrupt *papal Rome*. (See chapter first, section IX.) Concerning this primacy, Scripture is pretty full and very severe, speaking of it often, and condemning it very pointedly and very strongly. Of course, this primacy is not from God, because it is bad, and a bad thing cannot come from *the*

Good Being; and because it is strongly condemned, and he does not condemn what is according to his will, does not condemn what he has set up, does not condemn his own work, does not condemn himself. And remember that the condemnation is levelled not at the mere abuse of the papal or Roman primaty, but at this primaty itself; not at the mere excrescence or excess, but at the essence or existence. Remember that the thing is condemned not merely for going too far or being too great, but for going or being at all; is condemned unreservedly, condemned altogether. Now to the candid reader, I put the following query. Is not the Biblical condemnation of the bad or papal supremacy, coupled with the want of allusion to any other, an argument against supremacy in the abstract? Suprematy is mentioned to be condemned, none is mentioned without being condemned, condemnation of the papal being unaccompanied by commendation of the fancied pure; and therefore we may well infer that no rightful or heaven-born supremacy is now in the world. Were there a good supremacy, would God condemn the bad, without commending the good? would he contravene the papal or corrupt, without commanding the pure? would he speak frowningly of that derived from man and the devil, without speaking smilingly of that derived from himself? No. While hurling back the primaty that came from popery and Satan, he would bring forward that which came from Peter and Christ. Were he to condemn the bad without commending the good, he might lead men to disregard the good, and so might indirectly lead them to contravene his own will; and as he, *The Good Being*, would not lead men so, we fairly infer that there was not and is not a good supremacy. To forbid the wrong or papal primaty, and not to speak of any other, not to except the right one, if the right one exist, would be to throw the right one into the

shade, and to bring it into suspicion and jeopardy ; and as God would not so treat his own institution, (his goodness not allowing him to do so,) we may be sure that the right primaty is not in being. In fine, the rejecting of the papal primaty afforded the Lord the most opportune occasion (and an urgent one) for requiring the pure primaty, if it were meant to exist ; and therefore as he did not require the pure, it was not meant to exist.

Subsection V. Article 1. Affirmation third. "Peter's primaty or supreme spiritual power has descended to and through the Roman bishops, he having been peculiarly bishop of Rome." Now this papal affirmation I deny, flatly and fully deny ; and I will go on to show it to be utterly without foundation, or to be no better than the baseless fabric of a dream. It might be enough here to say that Romanites cannot prove their affirmation either certainly or probably, cannot prove it at all. They merely affirm ; and to their mere affirmation we might be content with giving a mere negation, our nay equalling their yea. But we will not be content with remarking that they cannot prove, for we will go on to disprove.

Article 2. "Peter was peculiarly bishop of Rome," affirm the Romanites. Now this we deny, flatly and fully deny ; and I proceed to show their affirmation to be a mere empty sound or vain boast, or to be quite void of solidity or of strong and prevailing proof. Whoever was first bishop of Rome, Linus, 2 Tim. 4 : 21, or another, Peter was not, was neither first nor second. If Peter were (but he was not) the bishop of any place, he was of Antioch. In order to see that Peter was not the peculiar bishop of Rome, let the reader peruse and ponder the following six arguments.

Argument 1st. We find in the New Testament, no mention of Peter's being at Rome at all, no account

that he was ever there during his whole life. Paul nowhere (not even in his Epistle to Rome) alludes to Peter's being there, nor does any other of the sacred writers allude to it, not even Peter himself. Babylon, in 1 Pet. 5 : 13, may be the real or great Babylon the ancient capital of Asia, or Babylon in Egypt, or Jerusalem, and probably the first. Now as Scripture does not tell that Peter was ever at Rome, we may certainly conclude that he was not particularly bishop of Rome. Were he the Roman bishop, some mention either of it, or of his being at Rome, would surely be made in Holy Writ.

Argument 2nd. No apostolic Father mentions that Peter was ever at Rome ; no Father of the apostolic time gives ground to believe that the apostle was ever there. Peter therefore could not be the bishop of Rome.

Argument 3rd. The earliest writers who mention that Peter was at Rome, do not tell that he was the peculiar bishop of it. They may write of his martyrdom, but write not of his episcopate ; of his suffering and dying, but not of his ruling. Therefore he was not peculiarly the Roman bishop.

Argument 4th. Several learned writers, Scaliger, Salmasius, Spanheim, Adam Clarke, and others deny that Peter ever was at Rome, deny that he either lived or died there. And as there is ground for doubting that he was at Rome at all, there is ground for being certain that he was not bishop there.

Argument 5th. In Gal. 2 : 7, 8, Paul calls Peter the apostle of the circumcision, or of the Jews. Now how could the active minister of the circumcision, live as the head minister of uncircumcised Rome ? how could the peculiar apostle of the Jews, be the peculiar bishop of the capital of the Gentile world ? How ? Not at all.

Argument 6th. An apostle was not confined to one place, but was a kind of bishop universal, having the

whole world for his field of labor. The apostolate differed widely from a mere episcopate. Therefore Peter was not stationary in Rome, but travelled up and down among the nations; he was not the Roman bishop, but a catholic minister.

Article 3. The primacy has not descended to and through the Roman bishops. Romanites cannot prove that it has, and we can prove that it has not. The pope is very many a thing rather than the representative of Peter. The Sovereign Pontiff of Rome papal, is the successor not of Peter, but of the *Pontifex Maximus* of Rome pagan. To show that the Roman bishops do not inherit Peter's pretendedly supreme power, I will give six arguments.

Argument 1st. John was the last of the apostles, and outlived Peter many years, thirty years, we are told. And during the whole or a part of the time from the death of Peter to the death of John, Linus, we are told, was the bishop of Rome. Now beyond all question, Linus was not the universal head during the life-time of John, Linus the mere Roman bishop was not supreme over John the catholic Apostle. John was over Linus, and not Linus over John. This is plain from Scripture. "First, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, &c. 1 Cor. 12:28. Some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, &c." Eph. 4:11. Moreover, it is plain from reason. The inspired apostle was superior to an uninspired minister; John, one of the very greatest of apostolic men, and the disciple uncommonly beloved by Christ, was greater than Linus, of whom little more is known than the name; John, the direct agent of Christ and the Holy Ghost, the medium between the Lord and the kirk, and to whom the whole christian world looked up with awe, John was above Linus, and supreme over him, a man of no note in Scripture or in apostolic history, and who appears to have been one of the many or

ordinary ministers. The general commanding the army, is superior to a colonel of a regiment ; the high admiral of the fleet, is greater than the captain of a single ship ; and the prime minister of the nation, is supreme over a magistrate of one county or one town. Therefore John the apostle of Christendom, was above and over Linus the bishop of Rome. It follows that if Linus or his successor had the universal headship at all, he had it from John, and not from Peter. The surviving or last apostle John being the supreme head, if Linus had the supremacy, he must have had it from John. But if the supreme power descended from John to any one, it went to his successor, and that successor certainly was not the bishop of Rome. If John's supremacy lived after him, it lived in his own immediate follower ; and the follower or successor (if any) was an Asian bishop, and not the Roman. If the primacy be in the world at all, it is in Asia ; therefore Rome must give up all claim, and be out of all hope. To sum up. John was the supreme over Linus—If the supremacy came down from the apostles, it came from or through John—Coming from John, it went to his successor—John's successor was one of Asia, and not he of Rome ; and therefore the pope of Rome cannot be the head, cannot be more than a member. It follows that the papal party should stop their boasting ; and that people ought to speak not of the supremacy, but of the subordination of the pope ; not of Roman primacy, but of Roman *secundaty*.*

Argument 2nd. The bishops of Antioch (if not those of Jerusalem) have quite as good a claim to succeed Peter, as have the bishops of Rome. Antioch has an equal or superior claim to Rome ; for Antioch was the elder see of the two, according to the Romanites, they

* I could not well avoid coining the word *secundaty* ; and it comes as regularly from *secundus*, as primacy comes from *primus*.

telling that Peter was firstly bishop of Antioch and lastly bishop of Rome. Surely the elder see may claim before the younger, the earlier see may take precedence of the later one; this being according to the law of primogeniture, or agreeable to the past and present rule of descent. Moreover, Peter lived at Antioch, and only died at Rome, even if he were ever there; and as the living is more important than the dying, the place of his apostolic life ought to carry it rather than that of his death. It follows that the bishop of Antioch has a title to the primacy, equal or superior to that of his rival of Rome: firstly, because Antioch is the elder of the two; and secondly, because it is the city where Peter sometime lived. N. B. Romanites affirm the kirk of Rome to be the *Mother* kirk. But the affirmation is contrary to history and Scripture. 1st. History declares Jerusalem to have been the cradle of christianity, and the christian kirk there to have been the earliest or mother of all. 2nd. Scripture proves the priority of Jerusalem. "Jerusalem which is above, is free, which is the *mother* of us all. Gal. 4: 26. Beginning at Jerusalem. Luke, 24: 47. The word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Isa. 2: 3.

Argument 3rd. The primacy or pontificate has been stained with impiety, and immorality, and crime, many popes having been very guilty before God and before men. The ecclesiastical heads of Rome have not been remarkable for virtue or wisdom, neither reforming the world by their moral qualities, nor enlightening it by their mental. Instead of being pillars of piety and examples of knowledge, they have often been quite the reverse, having often, too often, been supporters of sin, and upholders of ignorance, corrupting the world by the depravity of their heart, and clouding it through the destitution of their head. The popes have often, too often, been foes of moral purity, and enemies of mental light. Now were they the men to have and to wield the su-

preme spiritual power? to be the lords paramount of the whole christian world? or to reign and rule over the souls of all men and women of all parts of christendom? No. The Roman popes having been carnal, supreme spiritual power would fare ill with them, and would not be put there; for how could sinners promote sanctity? or how could unholy or ungodly popes forward the interest of the holy God? The Roman popes having been so bad, we may infer that the primaty has not been with them. See chapter second, section 2, argument first.

Argument 4th. That the primaty has not descended to and through the Roman bishops, any more than to and through the bishops of Antioch, Jerusalem, or any other place, may be inferred from our utter want of information concerning the legitimate line of Roman descent. (See Subsection 4. argument 2nd.) How do we know the real and rightful Roman successor to Peter? how can we clearly ascertain which of two or more claimants is in the direct line from the apostle? It would puzzle a wizard and a witch to tell how. By what rule can we fully determine the *direct succession* in Rome? By no rule. Who was the direct or lineal successor to Peter at the time of the council of Constance? Martin V, or one of the three deposed antipopes? Which was the real pope, he at Rome or he at Avignon? And during the forty or fifty years of the great *popan* schism, which of the three or two contending *infallibles* came from the prince of the apostles? and which came from the prince of the devils? Alas! We are quite at sea here, and without rudder, sail, compass, or star; and we have little hope either of long remaining safe on the ocean, or of finding our way to port. But again. The popedom has been gained by political intrigue, by fraud, by force, by bribery, by debauchery, and the like! It has been gained by a plot, obtained by a lie, won by the sword, bought with money, procured by a whore,

and so on! A man may become pope through a cabal among the cardinals, or through the influence of Italian princes, or through that of the king of Spain, or that of the king of France, or that of the emperor! A man may become pope through a cunning plan of deception! A man may become pope by the mean of an army! A man may become pope through buying up a majority of cardinals! A man may become pope by the influence of his mistress, a lewd woman, and perhaps the wife of another man! And men not only may, but actually have, actually have become popes in all these ways, as we too fully learn from history. Alas! Among that impious and immoral crowd of rebels toward God, where shall we look for the rightful successor to Peter? How shall we find supreme spiritual power in men wholly destitute of spirituality, and quite full of carnality; men actuated by no other spirit than that of the flesh, the world, and the devil? What direction does Holy Writ afford for ascertaining the rightful Roman holder of the supreme power? None. And we having in Scripture no rule whereby to know in what *popan* pretender to find the primacy, may well infer that in the popes it cannot be found, any more than in another episcopal line; or that it is not in Rome, any more than elsewhere. In relation to the line of descent, the claim of Rome is not better, even if it be so good.

Argument 5th. That the primacy has not descended to and through the Roman bishops, or that we want a proof of its having descended there, is clear from the utter silence of Scripture in regard to it in any way, in regard to its descent abstractedly, or in regard even to its existence in relation to Rome. (See Subsection 4. argument 3rd.) We are not told anything about the primacy, are not told that it descends anywhere or anyhow, are not told that it is in being, in the metropolis or domain of popery. We have seen, in last argument,

that Scripture nowhere makes mention of the line of descent of the Roman primaty, or nowhere declares in whom it shall be after Peter ; and we see here that Scripture nowhere makes mention of its descent at all, of its bare being, nowhere declares that it shall be in any one after the apostle, nowhere even alludes to the pretended primaty of Rome. As the Bible is silent relatively to other places, so it is silent in relation to Rome ; and herein therefore Rome has no advantage over them, or has no better claim than they.

Argument 6th. That the primaty has not descended to and through the Roman bishops, may be inferred not only from what Scripture does not say, but even from what it does say coupled with what it does not. (See Subsection 4. argument 4th.) In arguments 4th and 5th, we have seen that Scripture gives no direction for knowing its true line of descent through Rome, and gives no intimation that it does descend there, Scripture being silent in regard to a pure or heaven-born Roman primaty. But in relation to a primaty of another kind, namely, that of the little horn, or of the man of sin, or of the two-horned beast, or of the whore of Babylon, or in other words, of corrupt *papal Rome*, Scripture is far from silent, speaking of it largely and severely. Now finding that Scripture condemns the papal or bad primaty, without alluding to the pure one, I ask the candid reader if we have not an argument against Roman primaty altogether. Were there a good primaty in Rome, would the inspired penmen so largely condemn the bad, without at all commending the good ? would they so fully contravene the papal or corrupt, without anyhow commending the pure ? No. If they would do so, they might lead men to disregard the good or pure, and so might indirectly lead them to contravene the Divine will ; and as they cannot be imagined to lead men so, we fairly infer that there was not and is not a good

primaty in Rome. To forbid the wrong or corrupt primaty, and not to speak of any other, not to except the right one, if the right one exist, would be to throw the right one into the shade, and to bring it into suspicion and danger; and as God's penmen would not so treat God's own institution, we may be sure that the right primaty is not in being. The Divine condemnation of Babylon or Rome papal, having given the very best and an urgent opportunity for speaking of the heaven-born Roman primaty, supposing it to exist, as the Divinely inspired penmen did not speak of it, we may deem it not to exist but in imagination. We have to consider that a reason exists for speaking of the pure primaty, taking it to be in Rome, that exists not for speaking of it, taking it to be in any other place, a reason relating to Rome only. The papal, or bad primaty, that of the little horn, the whore of Babylon, or the like, is represented as being in Rome, in Babylon Rome; and therefore in condemning it, Scripture would be more likely to commend the pure or good primaty if in Rome, than if elsewhere. The bad system being in Rome, the forbidding of it would more naturally and readily draw the sacred penmen to mention the good one if existing there, than if existing elsewhere. We may infer this from the principle of the association of ideas in the mind: Rome bad readily suggesting the idea of Rome good, or the passing from the bad Roman primaty to the good one, being natural and easy. And even if the inspired writers should be willing to omit all allusion to the good one, the goodness of God would not allow the omission. Now; seeing that if the good primaty be in Rome, it would very naturally, and very probably, or even certainly be spoken of when the bad one was condemned, we, finding it not spoken of, may fairly infer that it is not in Rome.

Subsection VI. We go on to confirm the reasoning

of the three last subsections in opposition to the three great affirmations involved in the papal claim to the primacy, namely, *that Peter was the prince or primal of the apostles, that his primacy has descended, and that it has descended through Rome.* To confirm the reasoning, we declare that the claim of the Roman popes to have derived their power from Peter, was made not from the beginning, but from a far later date; not from the apostolic time, but only from the fifth century; pope Innocent being the first who made the claim. The Roman bishops did not claim from or through Peter, till many ages after Peter went to heaven. Now if the claim were good, why was it not made earlier? If the pope did derive from the apostle, why not state it from the beginning? If the pretended primacy of the Roman bishop were really obtained from the apostle Peter, why wait during four centuries or more before beginning to declare it to the world? The long delay in making the claim, proves that the claim ought never to be made; or as the claim ought not to be made during the first four centuries, it ought not to be made at all, or at any time. Delays are proverbially dangerous; and the delay here, is fatal to Rome. The delay in claiming the supremacy from Peter, shows that it did not come from him; for if it did come from him, it would be so claimed long afore the fifth century, and even ere Peter's body was laid in the tomb. If the primacy really came from Peter, it would be so claimed not only in the fifth century, but also in the first; and not firstly by Innocent, but firstly by Linus the first Roman bishop. In fine, the long delay of four centuries or more, proves the claim to derive from Peter, to be a mere papal phantasy, or Roman romance.

Subsection VII. Objection. If all the foregoing be true, if the reply to the three great papal affirmations be valid, and if the delay to claim from Peter prove the claim

a rotten one, how came the see of Rome to have the first ecclesiastical rank, and to be the first patriarchate, the first of the five, long afore the time when the Roman bishops obtained the proud title of *Prince of the Patriarchs*? how came the order of the five patriarchates to be, Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem? or how came Rome to take the lead?

Reply. The ecclesiastical rank of the see of Rome was settled by councils, and therefore was of merely human origin; and moreover, was proportioned to the political rank of the city of Rome. Man gave the rank, and gave it on political or civil ground. The ecclesiastics of the day, and not Christ or Peter, gave to Rome the priority; and they gave it because Rome was the capital of the empire. The rank came not from inspired Peter, but from uninspired this, that, and t'other; and came not because Rome had any peculiar title to spiritual pre-eminence, but because it had secular or political preponderance as the political metropolis of the world. Men gave rank to Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; and made the ecclesiastical rank of the sees, in proportion to the political rank of the cities: and what men did for these four, that they did for Rome. The origin and measure of Rome's rank may be told in two words, *Human* and *Political*.

To confirm the two points in the foregoing reply, (about the origin and measure of the rank,) I will quote a part of a canon of the general council of Chalcedon, held in the year 451, and consisting of 630 bishops "Whereas the *fathers*, with great propriety, bestowed the chief honors on the see of old Rome, *because it was the imperial city*; and whereas the 150 Constantinopolitan fathers beloved of God, actuated by the same motive, conferred the like dignity on the most holy see of New Rome, (Constantinople,) judging it reasonable that the city honored to be the seat of empire and of the

senate, and equal in civil privileges with ancient royal Rome, should be equally distinguished also by ecclesiastical privileges, &c. &c."

Subsection VIII. I conclude the examination of the Primaty of the Pope, by remarking that the primaty really began not when Christianity began, but 600 years after, having actually begun in century seventh, in A. D. 606, when the pope gained the proud title of *Universal Bishop*. The popan supremacy was coeval with the universal bishoprick, and came not from the Lord Jesus Christ, nor from the apostle Peter, but from the emperor Phocas; and therefore it is a *novelty*.

SECTION III.

INFALLIBILITY.

Subsection I. Where, in whom, in what man or men, does Infallibility reside? Who is infallible? Does Infallibility reside in the Pope, in the episcopal head of Rome? No, no.

Firstly. How will any-one prove the pope to be infallible? By what mean will a popite show that the great prerogative belongs to the bishop of Rome? Will he say that we know it intuitively, that we derive the doctrine from intuition? No. Will he say that we know it demonstratively, that we have the portion of creed from demonstration? No. Will he say that *popan** infallibility is probable? that it has the evidence of probability, if not so great as to be absolute certainty, yet so

* *Popan* comes from pope, means belonging to the pope, and appears a proper adjective.

great as to be far above doubt? He may indeed say it, and say it again and again, but can he prove it? Can he make it clear and plain? He cannot. Will he go for proof to Reason? Reason will laugh in his face, call him a fool, and order him to door, deriding, rebuking, and eliminating him for his irrationality. Will he go for proof to Revelation? Revelation will not befriend him in the point, will not give him the proof he requires. Scripture will be ransacked and examined in vain; and will show passages either to convince him of his folly, or to reprove him for his sin in pretending that an antichristian priest of an antichristian kirk, is infallible! The Bible will display the pope not as the great depository of Divine knowledge, not as infallible, inspired by the illuminating power of the Holy Ghost, not as God's great vicegerent holding the keys of earth, and hell, and heaven; but as the earthly head of a monstrous and horrid combination, a combination hostile, cruel, and destructive to man, opposed to, and abhorred by God, and in virtual league with the power of hell. "The horn made war with the saints. Dan. 7:21. That man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. 2 Thess. 2. He whose coming is after the working of Satan." 2 Thess. 2.

Secondly. I will give eight arguments from reason, to prove the pope not infallible, but fallible.

Argument first. The popes have been, in general, a bad set of men, very guilty and corrupt; and some of them have been exceedingly bad, horribly wicked and vile, uncommonly irreligious and immoral. The Roman Popes have been compared with the Roman Emperors. Properly speaking, the popes so compared ought to be the popes who lived after the pope became a temporal prince in the eighth century, and afore the Reformation in the sixteenth. Taking the popes who lived from the

eight to the sixteenth century, we find that both popes and emperors may be viewed as being, with few exceptions, bad, immoral, depraved men; but the popes are deemed the worse of the two. Now truly the bad character of the popes is an argument of some weight against the notion of their being endowed by God with infallibility.

Argument second. The same pope has been known to oppose and contradict himself, maintaining an opinion at one time in opposition to what he maintained antecedently. Now when was he infallible, formerly or latterly? And as he was not so at both times, how will any one prove that he was so at either time?

Pope Liberius, in the fourth century, declared himself by turn, a Trinitarian, an Arian, a Semiarian, and a Trinitarian again! changing his creed several times, and holding by turn, three creeds! What an admirable example of Infallibility!

Pope Zozimus, in the fifth century, first declared the Pelagian heresy to be *innocent*, and afterward declared it *impious*; formerly approving, and latterly condemning the same doctrine! According to Zozimus, orthodoxy in one year became heterodoxy in about a year after. He openly and officially affirmed either that Pelagianism is not a bad, but an innocent thing, or that Pelagius and Celestius were not Pelagians, but held a pure creed; and afterward recanted his affirmation, and affirmed the direct opposite.

Pope Vigilius, in the sixth century, and on the question of *The Three Chapters*, changed side four times, altering his opinion or creed like a very fallible, saying and unsaying, affirming and denying by turn! How infallible!

Pope Honorius, in the seventh century, changed his creed, going from orthodoxy to the Monothelite heresy.

Pope John XXII, in the fourteenth century, publicly

affirmed, in his sermons, that departed saints are not admitted to the beatific vision till after the resurrection ; and afterward, publicly and solemnly retracted his affirmation or doctrine as an error, declaring that he had been in the wrong. This pope therefore allowed not only his fallibility, but his actual mistake ; admitted not only that he could err in doctrine, but even that he did err.

Argument third. Two, and even three popes have been found existing at one time, antipopes, condemning, excommunicating, anathematizing each other. At the time of the Council of Constance, 1414, three men claimed the popedom ; and there were three, or two opposing popes during about forty or fifty years. Now which of the rival co-existing popes was infallible ? Will any papal wiseacre tell one that they all were infallible, though affirming contraries, things directly opposite ?

Argument fourth. Successive popes differ widely one from another in opinion ; the pope who comes after, often opposing and contradicting the pope who went afore. Who is infallible, the former pope or the latter ? It is clear that both cannot be so ; and why is one so more than the other ? Here we have pope against pope ; and one being fallible, the claim of the other to infallibility is an indigestible conceit, and a proud and vain pretension.

Pope Gelasius was formally and officially against both Transubstantiation and Half Communion. He has been opposed by a crowd of popes ; particularly by Innocent III and Pius IV on Transubstantiation, and by Martin V and Pious IV on Half Communion. Was Gelasius infallible ? As he was not, so were not they.

When John, the bishop of Constantinople, obtained the title of *Universal Bishop*, Gregory I, the bishop of Rome, very strongly and hotly condemned it, declaring and maintaining that whoever will take or accept that

*heretical, blasphemous, and infernal title, Universal Bishop! is vain-glorious, proud, profane, impious, execrable, antichristian, heretical, blasphemous, diabolical, the follower of Lucifer, and the forerunner and herald of Antichrist! and that the title neither does nor can belong to any bishop whatever!** But when Boniface III obtained the very same title, *Universal Bishop*, from the eastern emperor Phocas, in A. D. 606, he was of a different opinion from his predecessor Gregory I. Boniface III and all succeeding popes, either condemn Gregory, or condemn themselves; either declare that he was uncommonly erring and mistaking, or declare that they are uncommonly wicked and abominable, even infernal and diabolical. If they do not utterly condemn their own selves, and believe in their own antichristian, infernal, and diabolical character, they must deem Gregory to have greatly erred, and therefore to have been quite fallible. And Gregory being fallible, how can they prove that they are infallible? Not at all. Therefore all popes are fallible, or liable to err. N. B. Though Gregory was fallible, he was mainly right in his foregoing opinion; though he could, he did not greatly err in describing the character of the universal bishop.

Pope Honorius, after his death, was, by the sixth general or third Constantinople council held in A. D. 680, condemned as a heretic! and an organ of the devil! for having held the Monothelite heresy. The condemnatory decision of the council had the consent and approbation of the reigning pope Agatho, and of Agatho's successor Leo II, Agatho and Leo contradicting and condemning Honorius.

Pope John XXII directly contradicted his predecessor Nicholas IV, in relation to Franciscan friars having

* I quote the words of Gregory, from Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, Lecture XVI.

property; and termed the doctrine or opinion of Nicolas, heretical and blasphemous doctrine!

Pope Benedict XII contradicted and condemned the doctrine that his predecessor John XXII had held (and afterward recanted) concerning the beatific vision.

Sixtus V declared *ex cathedra*, officially, *infallibly*, the Sixtine edition of the Vulgate to be authentic and true; and afterward Clement VIII declared, *ex cathedra*, officially, *infallibly*, the Clementine edition to be the only authentic and true one; the two editions differing greatly one from the other, and being often opposite and contradictory! Now how can the two contradictory editions be severally authentic, true, or correct? And how can the two opposing popes be severally infallible? And if one be fallible, how is the other infallible? See James' "*Bellum Papale*, Papal War"

Argument fifth. No pope can perform a miracle, a genuine or true miracle, to prove that God has made him infallible. And when we contemplate the great import of the doctrine, and remember that Prophets and Apostles performed miracles to prove their infallibility, we cannot be deemed exorbitant or unreasonable in requiring the pope to favor us with a miracle, afore we believe in his infallibility.

Argument sixth. The popes have not proved their possession of infallibility, to the conviction of the world at large; for the world at large do not believe that popes are free from error, more than other men. Moreover, the popes have not proved themselves to be infallible, to the conviction even of their own kirk, even of the papal world; for real and true unity of opinion does not exist, and has not existed in the papal kirk. The want of unity of opinion among papal folk, is a conclusive proof that they themselves do not believe, do not credit, do not really and sincerely allow the pope's infallibility. Now when both the papal kirk and the world

universal, infallible, and infallible rule. Universal Bishop-
 of. is then declared, *primum, primum, impium, execrable,*
condemnable, detestable, impious, diabolical, the fol-
lowing of Lucifer, and the tyrant and herald of An-
telius, and that the title Bishop does not can belong to
any man, whether " But when Boniface III obtained
 the title of *Universal Bishop*, from the eastern
 emperor Phocas, in A. D. 686, he was of a different
 opinion from his predecessor Gregory I. Boniface III
 and all succeeding popes, either condemn Gregory,
 or condemn themselves; either declare that he was
 uncommonly erring and mistaking, or declare that
 they are uncommonly wicked and abominable, even in-
 fernal and diabolical. If they do not utterly condemn
 their own selves, and believe in their own antichristian,
 infernal, and diabolical character, they must deem Gre-
 gory to have greatly erred, and therefore to have been
 quite fallible. And Gregory being fallible, how can they
 prove that they are infallible? Not at all. Therefore
 all popes are fallible, or liable to err. N. B. Though
 Gregory was fallible, he was mainly right in his fore-
 going opinion; though he could, he did not greatly err
 in describing the character of the universal bishop.

Pope Honorius, after his death, was, by the sixth gene-
 ral or third Constantinopolitan council held in A. D. 680,
 condemned as a heretic! and an organ of the devil! for
 having held the Monothelite heresy. The condemna-
 tory decision of the council had the consent and appro-
 bation of the reigning pope Agatho and of Agatho's
 successor Leo I. Agatho and Leo contradicting a
 condemning Honorius.

Pope John 12. *condemned* his prede-
 cessor Nicholas II. a *heretic* & *antichristian* friend

himself an Arian. Pope
therefore deemed he-
Pope John XXII pub-
antiscryptural opinion
Pope Paul V formally
the jesuit, in defence

bility reside in a General
being viewed collectively,
fallible? No. To prove
00, but fallible, I will give

What is a General Council?
come together to form one?
must they severally have?
mens must they come? 4th.
they meet? 5th. When and
6th. How must they proceed
they determine by unanimity;
by a given large majority,
of one? 8th. What degree of
require a proposition to have?
can be middle, can be small;
can descend to doubt. How
tion be? Now afore we can
it be what many papal folk are
one, we must answer the fore-
and others that might be men-
found no trifling task, the an-
tions being a very puzzling and
eral council is a very vague and
that is the criterion or standard of
our people, two might consider a
and two might deem it special,
ality being perhap equally pro-
generality is a thing whereabouts A

at large shall have swallowed enormous the doctrine, we, my readers and myself, will view and examine the doctrine again, to know if the size of it will allow it a passage through our intellectual throat.

Argument seventh. Popes have given decisions, and promulgated opinions, in philosophy and even in religion, that are opposite to Reason. Now we can less easily prove the infallibility of the pope, than the infallibility of Reason; therefore we do wisely to hurl the former to the wind, and to cling to the latter with might and main. Surely we do well to maintain the supremacy of the reason of mankind in general, rather than to maintain that of the reason or whimsicality of an old priest in Rome.

One pope or more affirmed, officially and *infallibly*, that the Pythagorean or Copernican system of astronomy was wrong, and poor Galileo was immured in prison for declaring it true; whereas all the world know that the system is right, and that the papal pretender to infallibility was altogether wrong.

Pope Innocent III, under whom the fourth Lateran council was held, officially and infallibly affirmed the truth of Transubstantiation, a doctrinal monster well known to be wholly opposed to the plain and palpable dictate of reason. Moreover, other popes have officially affirmed the truth of the doctrine, Pius IV for example.

Argument eighth. Popes have given decisions, and promulgated opinions that are hostile and contrary to Scripture, thereby contradicting the word of God. Now as we know Scripture, God's own book, to be infallible, we are bound to set down the contradicting pope as fallible, erring, and vain, and every other pope as fallible, or liable to err. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God. 2 Tim. 3: 16. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. 1: 21.

Pope Liberius gave his open sanction to the Arian

heresy, and formally declared himself an Arian. Pope Honorius was a Monothelite, and therefore deemed heretical even by the kirk of Rome. Pope John XXII publicly and officially maintained an antiscriptural opinion relative to the beatific vision. Pope Paul V formally approved the doctrine of Suarez the jesuit, in defence of the *murder of kings* !

Subsection II. Does Infallibility reside in a General Council, the general council being viewed collectively, the members individually being fallible ? No. To prove a general council not infallible, but fallible, I will give eight arguments.

Argument first. Firstly. What is a General Council ? 1st. How many men must come together to form one ? 2nd. What clerical rank must they severally have ? 3rd. From how many nations must they come ? 4th. By whose authority must they meet ? 5th. When and where must they meet ? 6th. How must they proceed when met ? 7th. Must they determine by unanimity ; or may they determine by a given large majority, or by a mere majority of one ? 8th. What degree of probability must they require a proposition to have ? Probability can be great, can be middle, can be small ; can ascend to certainty, can descend to doubt. How probable must a proposition be ? Now afore we can decide if a given council be what many papal folk are pleased to call a general one, we must answer the foregoing eight questions, and others that might be mentioned. This would be found no trifling task, the answering of all the questions being a very puzzling and perplexing affair. A general council is a very vague and indefinite thing, for what is the criterion or standard of this generality ? Of four people, two might consider a given council general, and two might deem it special, the generality and speciality being perhap equally probable. This kind of generality is a thing whereabouts A

may believe, B may disbelieve, and C may doubt. Can papal writers lay down rules that will enable reasonable people clearly to know the exact essence or real nature of generality and speciality in relation to councils; to know always when a council is general, and when it is special? I trow not, I opine that they cannot. The generality of a council depends on no immutable criterion, is determined by no indisputable or indubitable rule, but varies with the various opinion of various people, altering the shape like a Proteus, and changing the color as a chameleon. Moreover, mankind are far from being agreed in relation to the number of general councils that have been held. Some will have six councils to be general, others will have seven, others eight, others eighteen, and others more. The main body of papal folk affirm eighteen to be general;—eight eastern called by the emperors, and ten western called by the popes. But if all these are to be deemed general, why are that of Constance and the like to be deemed special?

Secondly. Now is it probable that infallibility is joined to so indefinite and indeterminate a thing as a general council, a thing with difficulty recognized, a thing that can hardly be known; is joined to some kind of council, we hardly know what? Would God put infallibility in a place where we should have great toil and trouble in finding it, and where many would never find it at all, would never believe it to be? Would He annex it to mere indefinitude? If infallibility be given to the world, it is given for the world's good. What the better are we, however, by knowing that infallibility is somewhere; but where, we do not know? That it belongs to something, to a general council; but to what thing, to what council, we cannot tell? We may as well doubt or disbelieve that infallibility pertains to a general council, as, believing it, doubt or disbelieve that a council is general. We are as far from infallibility in

the latter way, as in the former. And God will not send infallibility in a form invisible to very many people; he will not make her dwell with a personage whose dwelling can hardly be discovered, can scarcely be known by a large portion of mankind. God will not give infallibility to some councils, and omit to tell man what councils they are, telling him that they are general ones, and leaving him in doubt and darkness as to what councils ought to be deemed general. It follows that papists greatly err, and leave the probable far behind them, in making infallibility depend on general councils.

Argument-second. Let us now, for the sake of argument, take for granted that the quality of councils as to generality and speciality, is easily knowable, or ascertainable without difficulty or doubt. The point of speciality and the point of generality that are nearest to each other, are so near; the highest limit of a special council verges so closely on the lowest limit of a general one; the top of the former differs so little from the bottom of the latter; the proximate extremes of the two are divided by so little an interval;—that it is extraordinary and wonderful how high councils special are the subject of fallibility, and low councils general of infallibility! The speciality and generality nearly meet, the line separating the one from the other being barely perceptible; whence then the mighty change, in passing the narrow boundary line, or in going from a special council to a general one, that we leave fallibility behind, and find infallibility before.

Firstly. Natural, intrinsic, inherent infallibility.

Case 1st. Assume that a general council must have 300 members. Now in relation to mere number, with 300, we find infallibility. But 299 are about as good as 300, the difference between the two numbers being trifling and inconsiderable; yet 299 are fallible. 299 are

fallible, errable, liable to mistake; but add one, and you add infallibility! This is wonderful. 300 are very little above 299, while infallibility is a very long way from fallibility, no proportion being observed between the jump in number, and the jump in wisdom, jumping an inch in the former case, and a mile in the latter. 299 being fallible, 300 may be deemed a very little less fallible, 300 being a very little more than 299; but to deem the 300 infallible, is uncommonly extravagant and absurdly disproportional. The leap from the fallibility of 299, to the infallibility of 300, is an enormously long one, and will perhap land the leaper in Milton's Limbo of Vanity, the Paradise of Fools. See *Paradise Lost*, book third.

Case 2nd. Assume that a general council must have bishops. Now in relation to mere clerical rank, with bishops, we find infallibility. But 299 bishops and a dean are about as good as 300 bishops, the difference between a bishop and a dean being not over weighty and awful; yet 299 bishops and a dean are fallible. Imagine 299 papal bishops assembled seeking the blessing of infallibility. Alas! they find it not; yea, though they tumble their brain over and over, they find it not there; though they shake their lawn sleeve, they shake it not out! though they dub themselves the only successors of the Apostles, they find themselves without infallible nod dles! What can be done? Throw in a dean.—Alas! A dean will not do. There is not enough specific gravity in the dean. The dean's belly, though large and round, and duly catholic or universal in regard to the variety of solids and fluids wherewith it is lined, is yet, as in duty bound, less ample in dimension and less fatly lined than the bishop's, having less absolution-money, indulgence-fees, purgatory-pay, and fewer devotee offerings, relic-proceeds, superstition-supplies, and other noly or unholy things; therefore the belly of the dean

is not heavy enough to turn the scale to the side of infallibility. But now clap an additional bishop in the assembly, and behold the happy result. The 299 fallibles being reinforced by a brother bishop, and they being now 300 strong of episcopal worth, are more than a match for error; far away fly all mistake, and all wrong opinion; off scamper all heresy, folly, and doctrine unsound; and up jumps, to the admiring gaze of papal gulls, the goddess Infallibility, having sprung from the 300 prelatical brains, like Minerva from the head of Jove, or like Sin from that of Satan. *Par. Lost*, B. II. What wonders are in papal skulls episcopal! Now we see that one dean may spoil infallibility. That the dean will spoil many a thing, I knew; but I hardly deemed infallibility to be one of them. A papal dean treads nearly on the heel of a papal bishop, in many a point; in opposing a Constitution, in reviling political reformation, in aiding Miguel, Carlos, and other tyrants, in upholding illiberals and *Inquisitionals*, in loving slavery on the Continent, in hating liberty in Great Britain, in cursing the schismatical Greek, in roasting the heretical Protestant, in eating up papal tithe, in longing to eat up Protestant too, swallowing fine loaves and fishes, standing up for sinecures, and the like. In these points, the dean has great merit, and is very effective; indeed herein, he may often pass muster for the bishop. But the dean has no hand at infallibility. His sleeves are not lawned like the bishop's, and his cranium is not equally endowed with infallible matter. The dean is good at an anti-liberal or anti-toleration exploit; but try him on infallibility, and he goes to the wall. As Ithuriel's spear tested the property of the toad at the ear of Eve, so infallibility will put to proof the value of the dean. None but episcopal wisdom will be able to guard man from error! Why the dean is so inferior to the bishop, I am unable to explain. Both will

boast of Apostolical descent, and will claim the power of the Keys ; but maybe the Apostolic character flows less freely and easily under the sleeve of the dean, and absolution from sin is performed by him with somewhat more trouble. Both are single, are without an equal in the clerical dignity of the cathedral ; but the dean is not *enthroned*. I have heard of the enthronization of the bishop, but do not imagine that of the dean. Who knows what the latter loses, in point of infallibility, through not being enthroned ? Could we enthrone a *very reverend*, I would back him, for infallibility, against the *right reverend* of Leon, or the *most reverend* of Cologne.* One thing more. Our dean may be wise and worthy, and our additional bishop, the three hundredth, may be foolish and unworthy. Now is not a wise and worthy dean equal, in playing the game of infallibility, to an unwise and unworthy bishop ? 299 bishops and a wise and worthy dean are fallible, but the same 299 bishops and an additional ignorant and worthless bishop are infallible ! Oh foolery, nonsense, absurdity ! Oh foolish Romanites, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth ? Gal. 3. Moreover, I desire papal oracles to inform one why 400, or 500, or 600 deans are not infallible equally with 300 bishops. Truly one bishop is not better, in finding truth, than two deans, is not better, and not so good ; therefore if 300 bishops be infallible, we are bound to believe in the infallibility of 600 deans. I should have less difficulty in believing infallibility in two battalions of papal deans, than in one battalion of papal bishops. Now a council having not 300 bishops, but 600 deans, and being therefore special,

* The bishop of Leon was an agent in England, for the Crue. and *Inquisitional* Don Carlos, a very unenviable agency ; and the arch-bishop of Cologne has acquired, through his opposition to the Prussian government, a political notoriety of a somewhat unenviable kind.

has, according to reason and logic, not at all less claim to be thought infallible, than a council general; and the special one being fallible, the general one is fallible too.

Case 3d. Assume that a general council must have either unanimity or a majority of at least 200. Now in relation to mere majority, with 200, we find infallibility. But a majority of 199 is about as good as one of 200, the difference between the two being unworthy of regard; yet the smaller majority is fallible. According to the assumption here made, (and we must assume something,) 199 are fallible, but 200 are infallible. Is this reasonable? is it agreeable to common sense? is it according to the intellectual procedure of rational people when proceeding rationally? It is not. No one indued with ordinary wit and honesty, will affirm that the addition of one to 199, turns fallibility to infallibility; that 199 being fallible, 200 are incapable of erring, and above mistake. The majority of 200 may be, in a very small degree, less liable to err than that of 199; but that it differs from it not only in degree, but even in kind, being not only less fallible, but even infallible, is neither more nor less than a piece of foolery. What! Is any man silly enough to believe that the difference between fallible and infallible, a difference in kind and a very great one, is no greater than that between 199 and 200, a mere difference in degree, and an extremely small one too? Whoever believes it, is really a kind of simpleton.

Case 4th. Assume that a general council must have probability to number seven. Now in relation to mere probability, with number 7, we find infallibility. But probability to number 6, or $6\frac{1}{2}$, or $6\frac{3}{4}$, is not far below that to number 7, the difference being slender; yet the lower probability allows men to be fallible. If the proposition be probable to $\frac{6}{7}$, the men are fallible; but if it be probable to 7, they are infallible. Strange and mi-

raculous! Oh papal swallow, how great is your diameter, to take in the like enorm monstrosity! Moreover, let papal wiseacres inform the world why a majority of 250 having probability less than 7, say $6\frac{1}{2}$, are not infallible equally with a majority of 200 having probability 7. If the increase in majority be not inferior to the decrease in probability, infallibility is not put in danger by the decrease. 250 minds with very little smaller probability, are quite as likely to find truth, to be infallible, as 200 minds with the greater probability of 7. Now a council having not a majority of 200 and probability seven, but a majority of 250 and probability less than seven, and being therefore special, has, according to reason and logic, not at all less claim to be thought infallible, than a council general; and the special one being fallible the general one is fallible too.

Case 3d. in relation to case 4th. The minority of 100 may have probability, subjective probability, probable conviction, evidence, appearance, to number 14, while the majority of 200 have it to number 7. Now why are the minority less likely to be infallible than the majority? If the minority be half in point of number, they are double in point of probability; why then are they inferior to the majority? Why are not both fallible, or both infallible? Moreover, a majority of 199 may have probability greater than to number 7, having it to number 8, or even to number 14. Now certainly if a majority of 200 having probability to 7, be infallible, a majority of 199 having probability to 8 or even 14, ought to be, if reason and logic are to guide, I do not say more than infallible, infallible and quarter, infallible and half, infallible and two-thirds, or the like; but I do say infallible ought to be infallible. Now a council having neither unanimity nor a majority of at least 200, and being therefore special, has, according to reason and logic, not at all less claim to be thought infallible than a

council general ; and the special one being fallible, the general one is fallible too.

Secondly. Supernatural and extrinsecal infallibility
1st. Can papal folk prove that God, not giving infallibility to a council having little fewer than 300 members, gives it to one having 300 ? They cannot. 2nd. Can they prove that God, not giving infallibility to a council not altogether episcopal, gives it to one composed entirely of bishops ? They cannot. 3rd. Can they prove that God, not giving infallibility to a council not having either unanimity or a majority of at least 200, gives it to one having one of the two ? They cannot. 4th. Can they prove that God, not giving infallibility to a council not having probability coming up to number 7, gives it to one having the 7 probability ? They cannot. Papal advocates cannot prove any one point of the four, nor any point like them, unless they prove by the argument of persecution, of brute force, of the sword, the fagot, or the infernal inquisition. As God withholds infallibility from the former kind of council, he does not give it to the latter. He disregards and contemns the papal minute distinction between a special council and a general one. Two councils differing in their nature to the breadth of half a hair, are not made so different supernaturally as to be, the one fallible, and the other infallible. Divine wisdom does not conform to our petty planning. N. B. Throughout the present argument, the general council is viewed collectively, the members singly being fallible.

Argument third. How can a general council, whereof every member is fallible, be infallible ? How can any given number of fallible singles, form an infallible compound ? How can infallibility be found in the whole, while it is not found in the parts ? Can that exist in universal, that exists not in particulars ? Would a collection of fools constitute a wise man ? Would a company of

beggars, each having an empty pocket, form a fund of wealth? Would five hundred goats driven together in a fold, become a flock of sheep? Twenty men, each having a portion of wisdom, may form here of a larger portion; one hundred people having severally some money, may make together a considerable sum: for one portion of wisdom differs from another portion, and one sum of money differs from another sum, only in degree, wisdom and money existing in quantities smaller or greater. But infallibility differs from fallibility not only in degree, but even in kind; they being not different measures of one homogeneous thing, but different natures or things; not variations in quantity, but separate qualities. It follows that several fallibilities, none whereof is a small infallibility, cannot compose an infallibility either great or small; many people, every one of whom is fallible, none of whom is infallible, more or less, cannot become one great infallible; ten men, or tenfold ten men cannot be one infallible monster. Whatever is in the genus, must be in the species; and infallibility being not in the species, not in the members, it is not in the genus, not in the general council. Infallibility not being in ten members, nor in two, nor in one, cannot be in the council; not existing in the men taken singly or individually, cannot exist in them taken collectively or aggregately. The prophets were inspired, and so infallible singly; therefore they were so collectively. The Apostles were inspired, and so infallible as individuals; therefore they were so as a body. And when the members of a general council shall be severally infallible, then we will allow infallibility in the council,—and not afore.

Some may object that though this reasoning is true in relation to infallibility natural, intrinsic, inherent, it is erroneous in relation to infallibility supernatural and extrinsic. But the objection, even if plausible, is

futile and empty. The reasoning is not more applicable to the former kind of infallibility, than to the latter, applying fairly and fully to both kinds. As God gives not infallibility to the men whereof the council is composed, he gives it not to the council. Not giving it to the singles, he does not give it to the compound; not conferring it on the parts, he does not confer it on the whole. The species being fallible, how can the genus be infallible either naturally or supernaturally? The men not being infallible singly, none of them being infallible, how can they be so collectively? It would puzzle a wiser man than Locke or Newton to declare how.

Argument fourth. Councils having as good right as any to be considered general, have opposed and contradicted one another, the latter unsaying what the former said, the following denying what the foregoing affirmed. I quote the following period from Fletcher's Lectures on the Roman Catholic Religion, Appendix, Note H. "General councils have enacted and decreed in direct opposition to the enactments and decrees of prior general councils."

Argument fifth. No council, special or general, can perform a miracle, a real or true miracle, to prove that God has made it infallible. And when we contemplate the magnitude of the thing claimed by or for the council, namely, exemption from error, we surely are not unreasonable in requiring the claim to be substantiated by miraculous proof.

Argument sixth. The councils special or general, call them whether you like, have not proved their possession of infallibility, to the conviction of the world at large; for the world at large do not believe that councils are free from error, are superior to mistake. Moreover, the councils have not proved themselves to be infallible, to the conviction even of the papal world; for real and true unity of opinion does not exist, and has not existed in the papal kirk. The notorious plurality of opinion among

papal folk, is a conclusive proof that they themselves do not really and sincerely allow the council's infallibility.

Argument seventh. Councils as general as any, have given decisions and sanctioned things that are opposite to Reason. Now when a council and reason collide, we do well to side with the latter.

The fourth council Lateran positively decided for the truth of the irrational and absurd doctrine of Transubstantiation. Moreover, the council of Trent very decidedly maintained the same monster doctrine, and with perhaps additional absurdity.

Argument eighth. Councils as general as any, have given decisions and sanctioned things that are hostile and contrary to Scripture. Now as we know what Holy Scripture is, and from whom it came, we view councils that wander therefrom, as wandering from truth, and as being a wrong and misleading guide.

The second Nicene council sanctioned and confirmed the worship of images, a very antisciptural thing.

The third and fourth Lateran councils warranted or sanctioned the deposing and dispensing power, the power claimed by the pope of deposing kings! and of dispensing with the allegiance of their people!

The councils of Constance and Trent, though fully and formally allowing that eucharistal communication in both kinds, in bread and wine, was the institution of Christ, and was long the practice of the christian world, yet antiscipturally presume to decide for communication in one kind only, in bread, daringly denying the wine to the laity. The council of Constance had even the daring presumption to call the laical use of the cup an *error*! to call the acknowledged institution of our Lord, in relation to present time, if not to past, an *error*! It follows that the two councils are self-condemned; that they determined in opposition to Holy Scripture, by their own confession.

Subsection III. Article 1. From the foregoing two parts of the present section, we clearly see that infallibility resides neither in the pope, nor in the general council taken collectively, the members individually being fallible. We proceed to ask our opponent where it does, where it can reside ; or what men are or can be infallible ; the infallibility being either natural and intrinsic, or supernatural and extrinsic.

Article 2. Does Infallibility reside in one or few members of the general council, and in no more ? No. If one or few be infallible, he or they are either known or unknown. Firstly. If he or they be known, he or they can be pointed out, can be mentioned by name, can be distinguished particularly from the less favored brethren. And as no papist does or can point out the infallible or infallibles, we clearly infer that no infallible one or few are known ; as no papist can name the gifted man or men, we are very sure that no infallible man or men can be specially or individually found. Secondly. Assume the infallible one or few to be unknown. The general council will decide either by majority or by unanimity. First by majority. 1st. The council will perhaps decide in opposition to the judgment of the one or few, not knowing him or them. Being ignorant who is or are the infallible one or few, the council may decide wrongly, or against the infallible opinion. Not knowing in whom infallibility resides, they know not whom to follow ; and therefore may follow the fallible, instead of the infallible. Ignoring the oracular man or men, the council, in effect, have no oracle to follow, deriving little good from infallibility unknown ; therefore they will possibly go wrong, throwing away truth, and adopting error. Being in the dark, the members of the council may mistake their way, as chance may lead, or as it may happen. Their decision is mere chance-work. 2nd. Even if the council decide aright, they do not know it ;

even if they finally concur with the infallible dictate or opinion, they are ignorant of their good luck, ignoring what opinion is infallible. They happen to be in the right; but for aught they know, they are in the wrong. If they have determined on the side of infallibility, they have made a lucky hit; but the lucky hit is one whereof they have no knowledge, and wherefrom they derive no consolation. So far 1st. and 2nd. Now assuming general councils to decide by majority, is it a likely thing to have infallibility in the unknown way? No. Is it probable that infallible wisdom is lodged in one or few unknown? Far otherwise. Can we reasonably deem one or few members of a general council to be infallible in such a manner, that the council may innocently decide against his or their judgment, or may decide conformably hereto, without knowing the conformity? We cannot. Second. By unanimity. If general councils decide by unanimity, the foregoing invincible objections to an infallible one or few unknown, namely, the objections arising from deciding by majority, would not apply or hold good. But unanimity in general or great councils, would be nearly a miracle. The like unanimity hardly ever has been known, and hardly ever will be. In a great council having hundreds of members, we shall possibly find tens of opinions; the opinions being to the members, as ten to a hundred, or as one to ten. What general council can be named, whereof all the members held exactly one and the same opinion or view, not differing in a jot, tittle, or iota? Real and sincere unity of opinion in general or great councils, is opposite to both theory and experience, and is a mere idle dream or vain imagination. Many men, many minds.

I have tried to prove that no infallible one or few can anyhow be found, or do really exist among the members of a general council. And I hope I shall be deemed to

have proved the point effectively. But even assuming that I have not fully proved my point, can any papite prove his point, namely, that an infallible one or few can somehow be found among them? No. A papite cannot prove the point. We may defy all the papites under the broad heaven, to prove the existence of one infallible or few infallibles in a general council. Papal writers may twist and turn, writhe and wriggle, and write till their paper be filled, their hand tired, their brain muddled, and their patience gone; yet they will not prove the infallibility of one or few. They cannot prove it, even if we cannot disprove; and I deem the foregoing remarks to be a tolerable disproof. Let the wise and worthy determine.

Many of the eight arguments in opposition to the infallibility of the general council, that were employed in Subsection II or last, might be given here, being applicable here as well as there. I do not however bring the arguments before the reader again, deeming it inutile to go over the same ground a second time. Therefore I merely refer the reader to them, in order that he may, if he like, turn back, and let them again go under his eye, and through his mind.

Article 3. Does Infallibility reside in every single member of the general council, or in all the members? No. The notion is too extravagant, preposterous, and absurd to require a formal refutation. Of all the wild whims that can enter the head of man, hardly one is wilder than the present.

Article 4. Does Infallibility reside in the pope and general council taken together? No. How can it reside here? As it is not in the pope, and not in the general council, the council being taken in any way, it cannot be in the pope and council combined. Not being either in the pope or in the general council taken separately or alone, it cannot be in them taken jointly or

together ; not being in the singles, it cannot be in the double or compound. Can two ciphers make an integer ? can two curve lines be a straight one ? can two nothings make a something ? can two fallibles form an infallible ? By no rule of logic. Let the reader remember that infallibility differs from fallibility, not in mere quantity or degree, but in quality or kind. In fine, the pope being fallible, and the general council being fallible, if infallibility be found in their union, it must be like a rivulet or stream without a fountain or spring, or like a second without a first, or a superstructure without a foundation, or a superficies without a line, or an effect without a cause. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean ? Not one." Job, 14 : 4. See Sub-section II or last, argument third.

It may possibly be objected that, as a corporation, the mayor and town council together, may be competent to do what neither alone can properly perform, so the pope and general council together may be infallible, though apart they are fallible. Reply. The mayor and town council separately have a quantity of power, though not a quantity large enough for the object in view ; but the two quantities taken together, form one large enough for the purpose. This civil power, however, is a thing differing in mere quantity or degree, being less or more ; and though the separate amount of the mayor or of the town council is too small, the joint amount of the corporation is large enough. But fallibility and infallibility differ not in mere quantity or degree, but in quality or kind ; and as the junction or juxtaposition of two fallibilities will not form an infallibility, will not alter their quality or kind, so the fallible pope and fallible general council together will not form one infallible combination or body. Two *threes* will make a *six*, but will not make a straight line.

Article 5. Does infallibility reside in any other set of

papal clergymen? No. The notion is about as ample and abundant in folly as any of the former, being one of the most wild, ridiculous, or monstrous notions that can well be imagined.

Article 6. Thus infallibility resides nowhere—on earth. 1st. It is not in the pope. 2nd. It is not in the general council taken collectively, the members individually being fallible. 3rd. It is not in an exclusive one or few members of the general council. 4th. It is not in every single member hereof. 5th. It is not in the pope and general council taken together. 6th. It is not in any other set of papal clergymen. It follows that papal pretension to infallibility is hollow, empty, and vain.

Subsection IV. Firstly. How far does infallibility extend? on what is it employed? what is the range or scope of its application? Does it include doctrine only, or practice too? Does it apply to both discipline and government? Does it encircle revealed religion only, or natural as well? Does it refer to opinion exclusively, or even relate to fact?

Secondly. If infallibility take in all, it has a very wide field of operation, and quite enough to do. Doctrine, practice, discipline, government, revealed religion, natural religion, opinion, fact, &c. &c. &c. &c. Poor infallibility! she has no sinecure. If she be compelled to settle and determine all of them, she will soon die through exhaustion and fatigue, overworking, and falling into premature old age.

Thirdly. If infallibility take in not all of them, but some, I beg to put two questions. 1st. What things are taken in? Several things are mentioned here; how many of them are within the domain of infallibility? Please to answer the question. 2nd. Who can draw the line of demarcation between all of them, pointing out the definite and exact boundary of every one, telling clearly

where one ends, and where another begins? Who can show the determinate line between doctrine and practice? Who can declare the definite limit of discipline and government? Who can tell, accurately and precisely, where is the bottom of revealed religion, and where the top of natural? Who can decide, within the breadth of half a hair, between the contending claims of opinion and fact?

Fourthly. Even if we could determine that all are within the sacred enclosure of infallibility, or that this, that, and t'other are so, neither more nor less, we knowing correctly their several boundaries, we should have to inquire farther about the measure or quantity of each thing. Assume doctrine to be within. Do our papal friends mean all doctrines, or only some? Assume practice to be within. Do they mean every part of practice, or only few parts? Assume opinion and fact to be within. How many opinions? how many facts?

Subsection V. If we were to allow infallibility in the kirk papal, we should be logically bound to allow it in the kirk patriarchal, and in kirks protestant; for the papal kirk can show no better title, can prove no better right to the high privilege, than the other kirks. They are all on a par relative to the point, all being fallible, or all being infallible. What rational proof, I desire to know, can a papite give for papal infallibility, that is not equally proof for the infallibility of patriarchite and protestant? If infallibility has been in Rome, it has been equally in Constantinople, in London, and elsewhere. If the papal kirk be of great antiquity, so is the patriarchal one; these two, under the names of western and eastern, long existing in rivalry, either as open foes or as jealous friends. If one be infallible, so are both; and we have the very curious spectacle presented for our edification, of two infallible kirks differing directly, point blank, front to front, on several points of import, particularly on the Procession of the Holy Ghost.

Subsection VI. Infallibility is not according to analogy, to philosophical analogy. We have no infallibility in other matters, in what may be called natural knowledge. There is no infallible authority in metaphysic, none in mechanic, none in astronomy, none in chymistry, none in aerology, none in geology, none in geography, none in zoology, none in botany, none in medicine, none in surgery, none in jurisprudence, none in political economy, none in history, none in chronology, none in grammar, none in lingual learning, none in optical and acoustical science, and none in any other like department of knowledge. Now the God of creation and providence is the God of redemption; He who ordered the system of nature, framed the scheme of christianity; He who speaks by the still small voice of reason, declares his almighty will in the volume of revelation. He who created and rules the world, with the worlds above, below, and around, sent the Bible into the world.

The voice that rolls the stars along,
Spoke all the promises.

WATTS, B. 2. H. 69.

Moreover, God is consistent with himself; what he does in one part of his wide domain, he leaves not undone, other things being equal, in another part; his plan of operation in the kingdom of nature corresponds with his doing in the kingdom of grace. And having given no infallible human interpreter in creation and providence, for nature, for the various field of philosophy, he has given none in redemption, for the Bible, for the whole or for part of christianity.

Subsection VII. Infallibility is not according to Holy Scripture, to the Bible. *Firstly.* From the first word in Genesis, to the last in Revelation, no proof can be drawn for the monster doctrine of infallibility. Examine the Bible through and through, turn it in every mode, weigh the several passages in the most accurate scales of

critical and logical exactitude, and you will find that it does not maintain this great pillar doctrine of popery. Twist and torture the Bible, pinch and squeeze it, use critical, grammatical, lingual violence and force, and you will have hard work, great labor, and Herculean toil to make God's word declare and pronounce for this Cyclopean invention of man.

Secondly. The Bible is even against infallibility ; not only not for, but even against. Many passages of Holy Writ, particularly of the New Testament, run strongly counter to the wild reverie. The passages are of two kinds. Kind first. They that are unfavorable directly or immediately. "Because of unbelief, they were broken off; and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, *if thou continue* in his goodness; otherwise, thou also shalt be cut off." Rom. 11: 20-22. N. B. We have to remember that the foregoing passage was written to the Romans, or the Roman kirk. "Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon earth; for one is your Father, who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters; for one is your Master, even Christ. Matt. 23: 8, 9, 10. Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy; for by faith ye stand. 2 Cor. 1: 24. Not as being lords over God's heritage or *clergy*, but being ensamples to the flock. 1 Pet. 5: 3. Beloved, believe not every spirit; but try the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. 1 John, 5: 1. To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. Isa. 8: 20. The Bereans were more noble than those in

Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so. Acts, 17: 11. Prove all things; hold fast that which is good. 1 Thess. 5: 21. From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. 2 Tim. 3: 15, 16, 17. Search the Scriptures. John, 5: 39. If any of you lack wisdom, ask of God." James, 1: 5. Kind second. Passages that are unfavorable indirectly or mediately, leaning against infallibility, by condemning popery. For as the Bible often pointedly and strongly condemns popery, we may fairly infer that it condemns, by implication, this great leading doctrine thereof. See chapter first, section ninth or last.

Subsection VIII. I have supposed, while making the foregoing remarks on infallibility, that the word is meant to be taken correctly, literally, with logical exactitude, or in the sense of inerrability. In this, the literal meaning of the term, the assumption of infallibility, either is a piece of impudent imposture and abominable fraud, or is mere adoption of error, a gulping of farcical and laughable conceit.

Subsection IX. If by Infallibility be meant merely this, that when all agree in opinion, they have probably the right one; that many are more likely to find truth, than few or one; that common consent carries high probability; that in the multitude of counsellors, are safety and wisdom; (Prov. 11: 14;) if this be all that is meant, the meaning may be well enough, but the language is incorrect and improper. The word infallibility is then a wrong word to be employed. Such infallibility is a

species of fallibility ; and people so infallible, are more or less fallible. This infallibility is not real but nominal ; being not the thing, but the name. Why use a term tending to mislead, if not to deceive ? If fair play be in the thought, why have foul play in the word ?

According to Vincentius Lyrin, that is to be held, that hath been believed *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, always, everywhere, and by all. I add two remarks. 1st. A doctrine so believed, implies a very great likelihood of being true, or a very small amount of fallibility, but not infallibility ; is very highly probable, but not infallibly certain. 2nd. Lyrin's universal belief relates to the whole of the christian world, and not exclusively to a part ; refers to the kirk universal, and not particularly to the kirk of Rome. It is therefore beyond the range of the present inquiry, one confined to the claiming of infallibility by the kirk papal, by one kirk of many.

Subsection X. The infallibility pretenders may be divided into three kinds. First. They who employ an erroneous and misleading term, and do not maintain the thing. Second. They who are chargeable with folly, who are led in ignorance, who maintain the thing through want of knowing better. Third. They who are guilty of fraud, who beguile the simple by uttering a lie, who maintain the thing while really disbelieving it. The main body of that portion of the papal world who maintain infallibility, belong, we presume, to divisions first and second. N. B. I do not mean that all of division or kind second, are either natural fools, or a set of *knownothings*.* Some of them may have great talent and great knowledge ; but on the point of infallibility, they appear weak or ignorant to a degree quite pitiable.

Subsection XI. Taking the word infallibility in the meaning given in subsection IX, namely, "that when

* *Knownothing* appears a desirable word to signify one very ignorant.

all agree in opinion, they have probably the right one," other kirks or communions are infallible like the papal one, such infallibility belonging, more or less, to every christian community. In that incorrect and improper signification of the term, infallibility may be affirmed of the kirk patriarchal, of the kirk of England and Ireland, of the kirk of Scotland, of the kirks Independent, Wesleyan, Baptist, Quaker, and other.

Subsection XII. Firstly. In Subsection I, argument sixth, we have seen that papal folk themselves do not really allow the pope's infallibility; and, in Subsection II, argument sixth, we have seen that they do not really allow the infallibility of the general council. The want of unity of opinion in the papal kirk amply proves that both pope and general council are really deemed fallible by the papal thinker.

Secondly. I proceed now to remark, that the same want of unity, the same plurality of opinion, amply proves that very many papites do not really allow proper or literal infallibility in any person or persons of their kirk; do not really allow it any where; do not really allow it at all. If the majority of wise and well-informed papites did really and sincerely think any party among them to be really and properly infallible, they would have no variety of opinion, no diversity of creed, no doctrinal debate; therefore the palpable fact that they have such variety, diversity, debate, is a convincing proof that they do not really and sincerely think any party in their kirk to be endowed with real and proper infallibility.

Thirdly. I am of opinion that some members of the papal kirk allow no kind of infallibility, neither real and proper, nor unreal and improper, rejecting it altogether, disclaiming at once both the thing and the name. I opine that some enlightened papal thinkers not only view the doctrine of real infallibility with contempt, and

rightly judge that no human being or beings upon earth form an infallible authority, that no man or men on the globe compose a tribunal from whose inerrable decision we may not appeal ; but even go so far as to avoid and condemn the use of the word infallibility as leading to error and as partaking of guile.

Fourthly. In concluding this long section, I take leave to counsel my readers, if they want infallibility, to go to the Bible and to God. "Search the Scriptures." John, 5 : 39. "If any of you lack wisdom, ask of God." James, 1 : 5. In the word and wisdom of God we have firmitude, plenitude, and perfection.

SECTION IV.

VULGATE, APOCRYPHA, TRADITION.

Subsection I. The council of Trent had the peculiar presumption, the extreme hardihood, the profane audacity, and even the blasphemy to pronounce the Vulgate, the Apocrypha, and the Traditions to have Divine authority ; affirming the Latin version, called the Vulgate, to be equal to the Hebrew and Greek originals, and the Apocrypha and Tradition to be co-equals of the Bible.

Subsection II. Vulgate. I deem it right to tell the reader here, that I wrote the paragraph foregoing, and the six points following, between two and three years ago, when, in common with some people, protestant and papal, I entertained the opinion that the council of Trent attributed to the Vulgate a kind of Divine authority, attributing it really and in idea, though not nominally and in word, intending and expecting their language characterizing the Vulgate, to be taken by the people in the sense of Divine authority, and that I wrote

the paragraph and six points accordingly. Further consideration, however, leads me to think it not quite fair to take for granted that the council attributed Divine authority to the Vulgate, or meant and desired the people to deem that version divinely authorized. The council literally attributed to the Vulgate *authenticity*, terming the version *authentic*. Now authenticity is not quite equivalent to Divine authority, and authentic is not exactly equal to divinely authorized. Authenticity may mean Divine authority, and may mean other things; and authentic may signify divinely authorized, and may have other significations. What the council meant and intended the world to mean by authentic and authenticity, I do not pretend to know fully and exactly. Perhaps they did mean, and did intend the world to mean, divinely authorized and Divine authority; but even if they did not, possibly many and probably or certainly some have thought, do think, and will think that they did; and therefore have thought, and do and will think, the Vulgate to be divinely authorized, or to have Divine authority, confiding in the supposed judgment of the council. Consequently I retain the foregoing paragraph and following six points exactly as originally written, warning the reader that I write there hypothetically or conditionally, on condition that the meaning be divinely authorized, or if the meaning be Divine authority. I write there against a possible opinion, namely, that the Vulgate has Divine authority; and all who hold the opinion, and only they may regard me there as arguing with them.

Point first. The sacred writers wrote the Hebrew and Greek originals, and not the Latin translation termed the Vulgate. This translation was the work of Jerome, and was made in the fourth century. Therefore the sanction of the inspired penmen cannot be claimed for Jerome's version of the Bible, a version made hundreds of years after they were in their grave. If Jerome were

inspired, his version would be inspired too ; but as none will presume to claim inspiration for Jerome, the most learned of the Latin fathers,* so none ought to deny that his Vulgate version is to be treated like another uninspired work, tried and tested by works that are inspired.

Point second. The Vulgate varies, in many a thing, from the original, the Latin differing, in a considerable number of places, if not in a point or two of import, from the Hebrew and Greek. Now how peculiar and extraordinary is the folly or falsehood in asserting that the Vulgate has Divine authority even where wrongly translating! Can the Vulgate be true, infallible, Divine even in its error, even where deviating from truth? The Hebrew and Greek original being the work of inspired and therefore infallible prophet and apostle, and the Latin version being the work of uninspired and therefore fallible Jerome, we are bound by reason, common sense, and logic, to make the latter turn aside and give way to the former, to make the Latin yield to the Hebrew and Greek, and not the Hebrew and Greek to the Latin.

Point third. After the time of the council of Trent, pope Sextus V made some thousands of corrections in the Vulgate; and after him, pope Clement VIII made herein some thousands more.† Thus two popes severally corrected thousands of errors, in a version that

* In calling Jerome the most learned of the Latin Fathers, I do not mean to put him above them all in point of mind. On the whole, he was perhap equalled by more than one leading Latin Father, and he was certainly not superior to Augustine. Jerome had more learning, Augustine had more logic; the former being the greater *memorizer*, and the latter the greater reasoner; the one being fitter for erudition, and the other for philosophy. Campbell, in his fifteenth Lecture on Ecclesiastical History, declares that "the two great lights of the Latin church, were Jerome and Augustin."

† See Infallibility of the pope, argument fourth.

their kirk had officially affirmed to have Divine authority! Moreover, Isidorus Clarius pretends to have rectified nearly one thousand faulty passages in that wonderful translation. Moreover, Bellarmine, a mighty and renowned papal champion, declares the Vulgate to require many an alteration and emendation. What now can be said of the *Divine* Vulgate, and of the decree of the council of Trent? We may truly say this, that the decree was not Divine, nor the council wherefrom it sprang.

Point fourth. The Vulgate perhap is not the best antient version of the Bible, being perhap somewhat inferior to the Peschito or Old Syriac. Three antient versions of the Old Testament are nearly equal, or not very unequal in point of fidelity and general merit, namely, the Peschito or Old Syriac, the Vulgate, and the Septuagint; and two antient versions of the New Testament are nearly on a par in general merit, namely, the Peschito and the Vulgate. And many or some Biblical critics deem the whole Peschito, or the Peschito version of the Bible, to be better than the whole Vulgate. The Peschito version of the New Testament is very admirable, being perhap the first antient version hereof both in merit and in time, being the best and the earliest, superior and anterior to every other. I affirm nothing of any other antique version of God's word, either in whole or in part, as compared with the favorite of popery. Now how could the council of Trent be so presuming as to attribute Divine authority to the Vulgate, when no one attributes it to the Septuagint, and when no one attributes it even to the Peschito, a translation perhap superior to the Vulgate? How could the council dare to affirm the Vulgate to be divinely authorized, while neither they nor any other would dare to affirm so highly of the Peschito, though perhap the best of all the antique versions of the Bible?

Point fifth. The Vulgate is by no mean superior to our authorized English translation, to the Dutch translation made by order of the Synod of Dort, or to some modern translations in other tongues; indeed it is inferior to them. Now suppose a protestant council, in London, Amsterdam, or elsewhere, to pronounce our English, the Dutch, or any other translation to have Divine authority, affirming it to be equal to the Hebrew and Greek original?—what would the papal world say and do? Would not their outcry, complaint, denunciation, and imprecation be both loud and long? Would they not expose and promulgate the folly and criminality of the protestant council and protestant world? They would. But can the thing that would be wrong if done by the protestant, be right and becoming when done by the papite? If protestants are bound to tell truth and maintain verity, are papites free to propagate error? and at liberty to proclaim an official lie?

Point sixth. The Vulgate, I know, has Divine authority, either if inspired or heaven-born, and therefore infallible, or if true and correct, if it agree fully with the sacred and inspired original, if it give the real, exact, or accurate meaning of the Hebrew and Greek. That however was not the sum total of what the council of Trent had in view, was not the full amount of meaning of its formal decree, as may be shown by two reasons. 1st. That Divine authority is conditional, contingent, built on the slippery word *if*. 2nd. That Divine authority is common, every other translation of Holy Writ having Divine authority of that kind, in that manner, on like terms, equally with the Vulgate; therefore in that meaning of the phrase Divine authority, the Vulgate is by no mean superior to any other Biblical version, all the versions being Divinely authorized. So far the two reasons. Now surely the council of Trent did not mean the foregoing *conditional* and *common* Divine authority.

What did it mean? what kind of Divine authority did it really affirm? It might possibly mean four things. 1st. That the Vulgate gives the main feature, the general outline, the leading particulars of revealed truth, of the sacred original. But every translation of the Bible then existing gave the same thing, so gives every one now existing, and so probably has given every one that ever has been existing. This meaning is quite true and undeniable, and one that none will gainsay. 2nd. That the Vulgate gives the inspired meaning of the Divine record, better than any other version, being superior to every other version of the Bible, being the best, the least imperfect of all Biblical translations, being a kind of *incomparabilis*. This meaning is opposed to truth and fact, as Biblical critics know. See points fourth and fifth. 3rd. That the Vulgate gives the precise, exact, determinate signification of the Hebrew and Greek, neither more nor less; gives the meaning, the whole meaning, and nothing but the meaning; gives the sacred, sense word for word, and idea for idea; being a version complete, perfect, and unimprovable. This meaning, this broad and sweeping import is not true, is very far from true; and its untruth could not be unknown to the council of Trent. This high character indeed is not true of any version in the world, far less of the Vulgate. See points second and third. 4th. That the Vulgate was so peculiarly, providentially, miraculously guarded and protected by God, while being made, as to be supernaturally kept free from all error, and filled with pure truth. That it is rather an original than a copy, having a co-ordinate authority with the Hebrew and Greek, depending not on them, but having a distinct and independent authority of its own. That it is true not only in fact, but even through a kind of necessity; that it must be true, that it cannot be erroneous, that it is inspired. This meaning is even farther from truth than the last, and flies in the face of rea-

son, insulting and outraging plain common sense. See point first. Thus it appears to me that the council of Trent might possibly mean the foregoing four things.

What thing or things however did it really mean? What meaning or meanings of the four, did it actually hold? Thing first is altogether out of the question. Meaning first, though true, implies not Divine authority; for though the Vulgate gives the main feature and outline of the sacred original, it is not therefore Divinely authorized. Moreover, the council of Trent would hardly be so foolish as to affirm, with all the sanction of its official character, a proposition that no one probably ever denied. To pronounce formally and officially of the Vulgate, what is true of every version of the Bible, and what indeed is quite undeniable, would be an act of solemn trifling, a display of weakness and mock gravity quite unworthy of a great council met for great affairs. Thing second, too, is out of the question. Meaning second, even if true, would not imply Divine authority; for even if the Vulgate gave the inspired meaning of the Divine record, better than any other version, it would not be therefore Divinely authorized. Now giving the council of Trent credit for common sense, I conclude that it meant neither the first thing nor the second. It follows that it meant the third, or the fourth, or both.

Subsection III. Apocrypha. To prove the Apocryphal books to be wholly without Divine authority, I offer eleven reasons, not as all, but as enow.

1st. They are nowhere mentioned, nowhere alluded to in the New Testament, receiving no notice whatever from Jesus Christ, or the apostles, or the other inspired people.

2d. They were not received into the sacred canon, by the Jewish kirk, to whom, in old time, were committed the oracles of God. Rom. 3:2. Were the books

inspired, their inspiration would be known to the Jews, and would be allowed and proclaimed by the Jewish people.

3d. They were not received into the sacred canon, the canon of Scripture, by the early christian kirk ; all the first christians either knowing nothing at all of the books, or knowing them to be merely human.

4th. They were never viewed as declaredly inspired, as professedly a part of God's holy word, as forming a part of the christian sacred canon, by the early enemies of Christianity, Celsus, Porphyry, Julian, and the like.

5th. The authors of many or most of the books are utterly unknown.

6th. The authors who are known, were not inspired ; none being a prophet or apostle, none being a man endowed with miraculous power, and none being even a friend, and companion, and colleague of inspired people.

7th. Not one book of the whole was written in Hebrew, the language of the Old Testament, all of them being in Greek, excepting Esdras second that is in Latin. N. B. What are commonly called Esdras first and second, are called, in the sixth Article of the kirk of England, Esdras third and fourth, Ezra and Nehemiah being here called Esdras first and second.

8th. Firstly. The Apocryphal writers, with perhaps one exception or two, do not claim inspiration. Secondly. Some of them actually and virtually disclaim it.

9th. The Apocrypha really contains folly and error, weak things and wrong ones.

10th. In many a point, some of moment, the apocrypha is even anti-scriptural, opposing and contradicting the Bible.

11th. No other external or internal proof of inspiration, that belongs to the Bible, belongs to the apocrypha ; the other proof that the Bible has of being in-

spired, not being enjoyed by its contemptible competitor, if one may be allowed to mention the Bible and apocrypha as competing.

Reader, I have here offered to thee my eleven reasons, and hope they will content thy mind, as they content my own. In fine, going from the special to the general, from the particular to the universal, I remark that the circle of argument showing the Divine authority of the Bible, does not exist for the apocrypha; the evidence applying to the former book not applying to the latter.

Subsection IV. Article 1. Tradition. We no sooner turn our thought to the subject of tradition, than we think of the Talmudical trash of the Jews. One might have hoped that the example of the Jews, annoyed and wearied in body, enfeebled and crippled in mind, prejudiced and hardened against Christianity, and rendered ridiculous and contemptible to others, by their huge and unwieldy collection of traditional trifles and foolery, would ever be an effectual warning to christians, to build their christian fabric not partly with the clay and mud of oral tradition, but wholly with the solid stone of the written word. Alas! The hope has not been realized. We find an ample store of traditionary, if not Talmudic christians in the kirk of Rome.

Article 2. A word or two about the Talmud, as more than one reader may not be aware of its nature and character. The Jews have two Talmuds, the Jerusalem and the Babylon. Each contains two parts, Mishna and Gemara, Mishna meaning *second law*, and Gemara meaning *perfection*. The Mishna or second law is imagined to be the oral law of Moses, or the interpretation of the written law of the Pentateuch. It is a large pile of traditions on many points, and by many people. The work was composed, or the traditions were collected and arranged, about A. D. 200, by Rabbi Judah or Jehu-

dah, who termed his work the Mishna. About A. D. 300, or perhap later, Rabbi Jochanan took it into his head to perfectionate the good work of Rabbi Judah, and therefore wrote thereon a commentary that he termed the Gemara. (Perfection.) This Gemara dealing mainly in the traditions known and current in Canaan, is named the Gemara of Jerusalem. Sometime after, Rabbi Ashe, thinking the *perfection* of Jochanan to be imperfect, wrote another commentary on the Mishna, terming his work, like Jochanan, the Gemara. This Gemara dealing copiously in the traditions known and current in the countries eastward of Canaan, is named the Gemara of Babylon. Now the Mishna and Jerusalem Gemara form the Jerusalem Talmud, and the Mishna and Babylon Gemara form the Babylon Talmud. The Babylon Talmud is, by the Jews, deemed the better of the two, the Babylon Gemara excelling the Jerusalem. Thus there are one Mishna and two Gemaras, and therefore two Talmuds. I may remark that the Mishna is a kind of comment on the Pentateuch, and that the Gemaras are comments on the Mishna.

Article 3. Concerning the character, tendency, effect, the good or evil of the Hebrew tradition, we find by the words of our Lord himself, that "the tradition of the elders" did great harm, putting aside or obscuring the written word. "The tradition of the elders" was preferred to the revelation of Jehovah; the fallible words of men being substituted for the infallible words of God. "Ye have made the word of God of none effect by your tradition." Matt. 15 : 6 ; Mark, 7 : 13.

Article 4. The Romanites, disregarding the obnoxiousity to the ridicule and blame of man, and to that far more awful thing, the anger of Jehovah, have taken care not to allow the Jews to have the miserable monopoly of the manifold evil of tradition. Accordingly they have tradition upon tradition, obtained through the channel

of priestly guile, resting on no authority but priestal unsupported assertion, and being impotent enough for anything good, though largely potent for evil. Papites pretend to derive their tradition from Christ and the apostles, as Jews pretend to derive theirs from Moses and the prophets; but the pretence, in both, is impudent and absurd. Papites however, I may remark, pretend to have two kinds of tradition, *apostolical* and *ecclesiastical*. The latter kind they do not pretend to derive from Christ and the apostles, but avow to derive from their mere priestal authority. In truth, however, the pretended two kinds are but one; for the traditions termed apostolical, are merely ecclesiastical or priestal. Or if some few really be apostolical, they are few indeed, not more perhaps than one in one hundred. Papal traditions are said to be about as bad as the Jewish. If all the papal traditions were fairly and fully written, they would perhaps rival the Jewish ones in number, in nonsense, and in *nonscripturality*.

Article. 5. Having made the foregoing remarks on Tradition, I might perhaps leave the subject as one not requiring to be handled more fully or minutely in a work of so general a kind as mine, a work going little into minute and dry detail. Regarding the question of Tradition, however, to be one of superior and vital moment; and tradition to be a thing of great repute in Rome, and of growing repute in Oxford; to be one that the Pope and company have long upheld as their firm upholder, and one that Pusey and company now try to uphold as an upholder of their more papal than protestant plan; I deem it right to go more fully or particularly into the character and groundwork of tradition, and to show that though a powerful engine for evil, it is weak in proof, or even contravened by holy Scripture and good reasoning. I will endeavor to prove tradition or oral tradition to be a thing contrary to the Bible, and opposite to right

reason, or to be a thing having neither a scriptural nor a rational leg to stand upon. I will give nine arguments.

Argument first. We may fairly infer from the language of the New Testament, and even of the Old, that oral traditions of Divine origin did not exist under the Law or the Old Testament dispensation. Therefore we may fairly infer from analogy, that oral traditions, derived from God, do not exist under the Gospel, or the New Testament reign. It is very highly probable, or even certain from the words of our Lord and the apostles, and even of the Hebrew prophets, that divine oral traditions were not given to the Jews; and therefore it is highly probable, analogically, that divine oral traditions have not been given to the christian world.

Argument second. This argument is a kind of *a priori* or theoretical one, and one wherein we argue in a kind of analogical way. As God enabled men infallibly to write a part, He probably enabled them so to write the whole. The written form being required for one part of Revelation, it was required for the other part; to be written being needful for some, it was needful for all. Why commit a part of God's revealed will to the firm hold of writing, and leave a part to the frail keeping of the mere memory or mere morality of a long line of clergymen? Therefore probably no apostolical traditions were given to the kirk.

Argument third. Setting up oral tradition as a rule of faith, is lowering and degrading the Bible, and leads to practical disregard to the written word. I may however be told that if there be apostolical tradition or unwritten revelation, the Bible ought not to have the whole of our reverential homage or religious regard, but that the written and unwritten revelation ought to share the homage or regard between them. And I may be told that if there were apostolical tradition, the Bible would receive its proportional and due share of our at-

tention. I however affirm, that if there were the unwritten word, the written one would not be proportionally and duly attended to, but would be comparatively neglected and thrown aside. Tradition would then be regarded too much, and Scripture too little. The foregoing would be the effect on two accounts. Account 1st. The bare doubt or mere uncertainty about what traditions ought to be deemed apostolical, would keep the mind in a condition of painful solicitude and feverish anxiety, and therefore would hold it disproportionately and unduly to tradition, and from Scripture. If apostolical or oral traditions did exist, they would cause so great an amount of doubting, disbelieving, and debating, of questioning and answering, denying and affirming, as to occupy the far greater part of time on oral tradition, and to leave but very little time for the written word; the dubious and difficult matter of tradition absorbing our time and thought to the comparative exclusion of the sure and plain realities of the Bible. If people had ground for deeming portions of divine revelation to be dwelling in the memory of men, or floating down the tide of time in the form of oral traditions, they would be led, by piety and curiosity, to try to find them out; and in hunting after unwritten and changing tradition, would neglect the written and unchanging volume. Account 2d. The clergy, assuming to be the guardians of oral tradition, and the medium of transmitting it from age to age, would naturally, in order to augment their dignity and importance, and to maintain and extend their power over the laity or people, lay too great stress on tradition, and too little on Scripture; would naturally, in order to exalt themselves, magnify that whereby they would be magnified, namely, tradition, and undervalue that whereby they would be rendered less important, namely, the Divine Scripture. The priesthood, as the channel or conveyer of oral tradi-

tion, would be tempted and drawn to honor and uphold the unwritten at the expense of the written word, and therefore to become more wanted and influential, unduly crying up the value of the former, in order unduly to cry up their own value. This reasoning accords with what we know of human nature, and what we have seen in the papal priesthood. Now as, on the two accounts foregoing, tradition would deprive Scripture of its due part of attention, we may infer that probably no apostolical traditions were given to the kirk.

Argument fourth. No real hint can be found in Scripture, of oral tradition being permanently, or after the completion of the canon of Scripture, a concurrent rule of faith, the authoritative colleague of the Bible. Not a single passage of Holy Writ can be brought forward fairly showing the written word to be only a part of the christian rule of faith, and the unwritten tradition to be the other part. According to what we read, *the rule of faith is the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible.*

Argument fifth. The Primitive Christian Fathers do not allow, or do even disallow tradition as a rule of faith, and appeal not to an oral standard of authority, but only to the written word. The early Fathers looked up to the Bible, and not to an indefinite thing floating unprotectedly through the memory of a line of men, and being liable to adulteration by every one of the line. Therefore probably no apostolical traditions were given to the kirk.

Argument sixth. Apostolical tradition more than the written word, would tend to magnify and exalt the clergy at the expense of the laity, or would afford room for the undue, unholy, and unhappy assumption and dominion of the priesthood over the mind, body, and estate of the people. Unwritten tradition being conveyed down the stream of time by the clergy, and there-

fore depending somewhat on them, would, more than written, occasion clerical presumption and arrogant bearing, and give ground for their growth, not in grace, but in pride, power, plenty, pomp, and the like. Look at the papal priesthood in every age and country ; and you will find that when and where Tradition has been more regarded, they have been more corrupt ; the honor of tradition and the dishonor of the priesthood having, other things being equal, been in proportion, or gone hand in hand. Apostolical oral tradition more than apostolical writing, would afford a handle for ecclesiastical corruption, or for priestly pride, power, and the like ; and therefore, probably, Divine revelation was committed not partly to memorial or oral tradition, but wholly to the Bible, to the firm hold and safe keeping of the written word.

Argument seventh. How utterly improbable the pure descent of tradition ! How nearly impossible that the unwritten word or oral traditions would be transmitted or handed down from Christ and the apostles to us, quite uncorruptedly, or quite free from alteration, addition, or subtraction ! Regard two points. 1st. How could we depend on the *memory* of thousands or millions of men in a great multitude of particulars ? We could not depend thereon. 2d. How could we depend on the *honesty* of so many men in so many matters ? We could not depend thereon. Now from the foregoing two points, we learn that the very great number of individuals forming the long line of the priesthood, might easily corrupt oral tradition, corrupting in a twofold way, through want of memory and want of honesty, being defective in power and inclination, being both unable and unwilling. Hardly two men relate one and the same particular alike, or tell one and the same tale or anecdote without considerable variation. We may perhap be told that no tradition ought to be received but what would

agree with the rule of Vincent of Lerins, but what would have been held *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, always, every where, and by all. Many a papite often desire to appear fond of the rule, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Alas for them! May we not infer *a priori*, or with a kind of anterior probability, that by the real application of the rule, the whole or very nearly the whole of papal traditions would be quite swept away? How many or rather how few papal traditions would fully come up to the foregoing rule! Now God foreknowing the result, that oral tradition would become corrupt, corrupted by men through weak memory, or weak morality, or both, did not commit a part of his revealed truth to the unsafe conveyance of oral tradition.

Argument eighth. Many papal traditions are confessedly and avowedly not apostolical, but merely ecclesiastical or priestal. Now from the confession and avowal, I go on to infer three things. 1st. Very few (if any) apostolical traditions are existing. If many apostolical traditions existed, few ecclesiastical or priestal ones would be really required and would exist, there being no need of many of both kinds; therefore as there are many of the latter, there are few of the former. The Bible and many apostolical traditions together would, even, according to papal view, meet nearly every want that can occur, and serve for nearly every case that can be found, and so leave room for but few traditions ecclesiastical; therefore the ecclesiastical being many, the apostolical are no more than few. The many traditions ecclesiastical doing so great a part, leave no more than a very little part to be done by traditions apostolical; and as the very little part can be done by very few of the latter, very few merely can be found existing. Now no more than very few apostolical traditions existing, it is probable that no apostolical tradi-

tions exist or were given to the kirk, it being probable that no new and separate mode of divine revelation was employed to meet a single cause or two. 2d. Ecclesiastical traditions would often be put forward under the cloak of apostolical ones, or as being apostolical, if the latter existed. This inference I take to be clear. Therefore probably no apostolical traditions exist or were given to the kirk. 3rd. It would sometime or often be difficult to distinguish an apostolical tradition from an ecclesiastical one, or to point out the former from the latter. How could we clearly ascertain what would be really apostolical, and what would not? We may be told that the foregoing rule of Vincent of Lerins would keep all right. (See argument seventh.) That rule however would not alway clearly determine the point, would not alway guide one aright. Therefore probably no apostolical traditions are existing or were given to mankind.

Argument ninth. Viewing the matter not as anteriorly probable, or viewing it not in the theoretical way, but in the way of fact and actuality, what do we find? What are the papal traditions? how are they characterized? whether we regard all papal traditions, or more particularly those that are not confessedly or not avowedly ecclesiastical, those that are pretendedly apostolical. How many or rather how few can for a moment be deemed apostolic! Hardly one may claim the apostolic character. Can two papal traditions be fully or clearly proved to be apostolical? First prove it of one, then go on to two, then to three, and so on. I opine that the prover will not have to go on far, or will not have a long journey. How many or rather how few are according to the rule of Vincent of Lerins, or have been held *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, always, every where, and by all! How small a number will that rule sanction? one in one hundred? one in one thousand? or

even any one at all? A full or *bona fide* application of the rule, will leave so very few apostolical traditions, (if it leave any,) and so very many ecclesiastical ones, as to render apostolical tradition a thing not worth being contended for merely on its own account, or merely in relation to itself alone. Apostolical tradition is cried up by the Roman clergy, not on account of its real worth or intrinsic value, but because it is a medium of promoting their own power, forwarding their own interest, and gaining their carnal end; because it is a convenient inlet for whatever crafty invention an ambitious clergy can desire to impose on the conscience of the laity. The papal priesthood try to make tradition compete with Scripture, that they may the more easily control the people. They employ tradition as a stepping-stone to their papal tyranny. I wind up or conclude my remarks on tradition, by desiring the reader to weigh and remember the following four things. 1st. Some traditions contradict others. 2d. Some traditions are either directly or indirectly contrary to Scripture. 3d. Some traditions are either directly or indirectly opposed and condemned by the early Fathers. 4th. Some traditions are unsupported and unmentioned by, and therefore were unknown to the early or primitive Fathers.

Subsection V, Firstly. The Bible, the written word, was and is held up before the world by the papal priesthood generally, and was so by the council of Trent specially, as an imperfect or inadequate guide in religion, or as a partial rule of faith. The Bible indeed is inadequate, and so is Reason, and so are both combined, to guide people to popery, to lead them to the goal that the priests pointed out to them, to render men and women the mere property of a proud, pampered, and carnal priesthood, or to prove the monstrous conglomeration of papal foolery and papal fraud. And the inade-

quation of the Bible in popery, not in religion, was the reason why the pope and his satellites laid their unholy hand on the Vulgate, Apocrypha, and Tradition, by the combined operation of which three things, any thing may be proved, and any thing disproved; pure religion be thrown down, and the papal image be set up in the province of Babylon. Dan. 3; Rev. 14:8; and 17:5; and 18. Popery is not in the Bible, and could not be upheld by the weak prop of infallibility; therefore it was found expedient and unavoidable to look around for other aid. The recourse to the Vulgate, Apocrypha, and Tradition, was the last expedient, the dernier resort, the forlorn hope of falling popery; it was the desperate measure of desperate men. The proverb tells, "Any port in a storm."

Secondly. Though the Divine authority of the Vulgate, Apocrypha, and Tradition had been advanced partially, cautiously, stealthily afore the time of the council of Trent, it was first proclaimed, formally and officially, by that notorious council. Why was not the formal and official proclamation afore that time? Because of the reason following. Ere the Reformation people were content to take things for true on priestal assertion only, to believe on trust, to credit without proof; but after that grand event, they would have sufficient ground, would require ample evidence from some real or supposed fountain of authority beside the priesthood. And as neither Holy Scripture nor Reason afforded good ground for papal invention and imposition, the pope and papal priesthood were obliged to have formal and open recourse to the Vulgate, Apocrypha, and Tradition. The three things were taken to do what the Bible and Reason leave undone.

Thirdly. We run a fearful risk in profanely tampering with the sacred record, we incur a solemn and awful responsibility in presuming to make Divine revelation

appear an uncertain and unsafe directory to heaven, we encounter a terrible hazard and dreadful danger in falsely attributing the Vulgate, Apocrypha, and Tradition to God, with a view of protecting, by their spurious or adulterine aid, things that God's word and will refuse to sanction, or even clearly condemn. "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. Rev. 22. If any preach any other gospel unto you than what ye have received, let him be accursed. Gal. 1:9. Add thou not unto God's words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar. Prov. 30:6. What thing soever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish therefrom." Deut. 12:32.

SECTION V.

KNOWLEDGE A PROSCRIBED THING, AND THE BIBLE A FORBIDDEN BOOK.

Subsection I. Knowledge a proscribed thing. Popular ignorance is the papal favorite. Popery will have the people to be ignorant of the Bible, and of all other books that tend to enlighten and improve the public mind; ignorant of theology, and of all parts of knowledge that are fitted to inform and expand the soul, to make it more intellectual, more free, and more elevate in the scale of being. Popery promotes popular ignorance of

all kind; of revealed religion, and of natural; of christianity, and of philosophy; of the Bible, and of books on natural knowledge; of the hope and consolation of Divine revelation, and of the broad and beneficial power of human reason. Popery fears knowledge, and encourages ignorance degrading and brutal.

Popery fears and proscribes philosophy in general, but not every kind of philosophy alike. It does more particularly hate and interdict moral and political philosophy, whereby we become acquainted with the nature of liberty ecclesiastical and political, and learn the reciprocal duty and right of men. Knowledge and philosophy, particularly moral and political philosophy, lead to liberty and popular right; therefore they are feared and forbidden by the pope and priesthood of Rome.

Ignorance is the mother of devotion, according to the kirk of Rome. Agreeably to that vile, stupid, and wicked maxim, this unchristian kirk favors ignorance as her natural element, as a friend and ally in the work, less of saving people than of enslaving them. And by keeping the popular mind dark and degraded, popery is an instrument not of guiding men through wisdom's way to glory, but of leading them blindfold to destruction. Instead of saying that ignorance is the mother of devotion, we may say that ignorance is the mother of popery, ay, and the daughter too; ignorance being of popery, both mother and daughter, both cause and effect. If ignorance be the mother of devotion, where can be the "reasonable service" enjoined by Paul? Rom. 12:1.

Subsection II. Article 1. The Bible a forbidden book. That papal folk in general have been forbidden to read the Bible, hindered from searching the Scripture, kept from consulting the blessed book of God, is too well known to require formal proof. Popery prospers far better in darkness than in light; and therefore loves the former, and hates the latter. Popery came

from the dark, from darkness thicker than Egyptian, and so retains an affection for its native element. Papal priests are well aware that their papal interest requires them to keep the people ignorant of God's word, as God's word condemns popery; therefore they vigorously exert themselves to keep their people about as ignorant of the Bible, as of the Koran. Of course, I write here of the priesthood in general, of the body at large, and not of the good minority. The pope and priesthood of Rome, or a great majority of them, do what they can to keep the great charter of Salvation from the hand, the head, the heart of the people, knowing that if the people become generally owners of the Bible, and generally acquainted with its contents, they will learn the real nature of popery, the unchristian character and fatal effect, will break through the galling and degrading restriction and shackle laid on them by their priesthood, and will take their departure from the mystical Babylon.

I here quote the remarkable counsel given to the pope, by the papal bishops assembled at Bononia, sometime after the Reformation had begun, in order to consult about the upholding and confirming of popery; where and when, among other things, they gave the following as their last advice, and as the greatest and weightiest of all. "That by all means, as little of the Gospel as might be, especially in the vulgar tongue, should be read to the people; and that that little which is in the Mass, ought to be sufficient: neither should it be permitted to any mortal to read more. For so long as men were contented with that little, all things went well with them; but quite otherwise, since more was commonly read. That in short the Scripture is that book which, above all others, hath raised those tempests and whirlwinds with which we were almost carried away. And in truth, if any one diligently considers it, and compares it with what is done in our church, he

will find them very contrary to each other, and our doctrine to be not only very different from it, but repugnant to it." See *Tillotson*, Sermon xxx.

The council of Trent declared as follows, according to the translation of the learned Hartwell Horne's Protestant Memorial. "Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it; it is on this point referred to the judgment of the bishops or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or the confessor, *permit* the reading of the Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the *presumption* to read or possess them without such written permission, *he shall not receive absolution* until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary!"

The doctrine or practice of the Roman kirk, of making the Bible a sealed book, a dead letter, a perfect prisoner, an inoperative thing, is utterly opposed to reason and revelation. Firstly. Unreasonable. I will give six reasons. 1st. We are bound to know God's will as revealed in his word, therefore we ought to read what he has caused to be written. 2d. We are bound to use our own reason in judging of the Divine word and will, therefore we ought to read for ourselves. 3d. We are the more bound so to do, because of the variety of theological opinion in the world. 4th. Better go to the clear and pure original spring or fountain-head, than drink from puddled streams, from the water rendered muddy by running over the impure ground of human error and folly. 5th. Reading the holy Bible may quicken our affection for holy life, may warm our

nobler feeling, and may lead us to tend from bad to good, and from good to better. 6th. The Spirit acts through and by the written word; therefore in duly and fitly reading the sacred oracle, we may expect to receive the sanctifying and comforting operations of the Holy Ghost, the sanctifier and comforter. Secondly. Unscriptural. "These words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, &c. Deut. 6:6-9. To the law, and to the testimony. Isa. 8:20. Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read. Isa. 34:16. Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures. Matt. 22:29. What is written in the law? how readest thou? Luke, 10:26. Search the Scriptures. John, 5:39. The Bereans were more noble, in that they searched the Scriptures daily. Acts, 17:11. Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope. Rom. 15:4. I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say. 1 Cor. 10:15. If any preach any other gospel—let him be accursed. Gal. 1:9. Take the sword of the Spirit, the word of God. Eph. 6:17. And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent. Phil. 1:9, 10. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, in all wisdom. Col. 3:16. Prove all things; hold fast that which is good. I charge you, by the Lord, that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren. 1 Thess. 5:21, 27. From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. 2 Tim. 3:15, 16, 17. Be ready alway to

give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you. 1 Pet. 3: 15. We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed. 2 Pet. 1: 19. Beloved, believe not every spirit; but try the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. 1 John 4: 1. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep the things that are written therein; for the time is at hand. Rev. 1: 3. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." Rev. 2 and 3. Paul's Epistles, excepting those to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, are addressed to the kirk members in general, to the kirk at large; and not to the priestal part merely. James writes "to the twelve tribes that are scattered abroad." Peter writes the first epistle "to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, &c." and writes the second "to all that have obtained like precious faith with us." John writes the first epistle "to children, fathers, and young men." 1 John, 2: 1, 12, 13, 14. Jude writes "to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called."

Article 2. Firstly. The kirk of Rome is well known to oppose the Bible Society; to regard with fear, to watch with jealous caution, and to contravene, with ready zeal, the beneficent operation of that godlike institution. What is the Bible Society? Simply a grand institution, a magnificent engine, a powerful union for translating into every language, and sending to every nation, people, and family on the globe, the Bible, the pure Bible, the Bible without note or comment, without human exposition or human creed. Now what is here to excite the anger, and call out the opposition of christian men? The Bible Society causes no anger or opposition in heaven. Indeed, the birth of the noble Society caused joy in heaven among the saints, among the angels,

of God, and even to God himself ; but spread disappointment, chagrin, and alarm through all the variety of diabolic powers. Popery, well knowing its anti-biblic origin and character, refuses to be tried and tested by the sacred standard, and therefore opposes the Bible Society. If Popery be according to the Bible, why is it afraid of the Bible and of the Society for promoting Biblical diffusion and control ? If Popery were in the Bible, the fear would be ungrounded and irrational. If Popery came whence the Bible came, and go whither the Bible goes ; if it be a friend, ally, and coadjutor of the Bible, why is it a foe of a Society that, by enabling the Bible to travel over the world, would enable Popery to travel with it hand in hand and cheek by jole ?

Secondly. The comical fancy of the Bible and Popery travelling together in co-operative union, reminds one of Lafontaine's fable of the two pots, the iron and the earthen pot, *le pot de fer et le pot de terre*, who took it into their head to agree to travel together to see the world, to study men and manners, to observe many a climate and constitution,

To talk of sciences and arts,
And knowledge gained in foreign parts.—UNKNOWN.

All things being ready, off started our travellers, the two pots, on the grand tour *clopin-cloquant comme ils peuvent*, hobbling, waddling, tumbling along as well as they were able. They had not gone far, however, when, by jostling and knocking against each other, the pot of iron, being the harder and heavier of the two, broke the pot of earth, shattered its fragile companion to pieces, and strewed its unlucky fellow-traveller in the dust, where it lies, ill-starred wight, a monument of fallen greatness, a memorial of prostrate ambition, an example of high hope laid low in ruin !

Ruin seize thee, ruthless iron pot!
 Confusion on thy lonely travel wait!

GRAY, altered.

Now I humbly opine that the earthen pot of popery would not have gone far with the iron pot of the Bible, when by Biblical knocking and thumping, it would be brought to the level, and be compelled to share the melancholy fate of its renowned forerunner and prototype described by Lafontaine. Then the pope, the cardinals, the other papal priests both secular and regular, the monks and nuns, the eremites and friars "white, black, and gray, with all their trumpery," the contents of the popery pot, would be whirled about and aloft, the sport of every wind, as if not bigger nor more important than so many Lilliputians or Tom Thumbs; or perhap would be broken down to a crowd of little atoms wandering about at random, and calling on their blind god Chance to unite them into some other system of folly and of fraud. Popery appears to have a strong instinctive feeling that it is an earthen pot, being hugely afraid of confiding in the travelling attention of the iron pot Bible. The pope and priesthood of Rome know better than to commit their brittle earthy papal pot to a concussion with the hard and ferrean texture of Holy Writ; being well aware that their frail vehicle would be broken by the contact, and they, its contents, spilled upon the ground.

Hence, vain deluding joys,
 The brood of Folly, without father bred!
 How little you bested,
 Or fill the fixed mind with all your toys!
 Dwell in some idle brain,
 And fancies fond with gaudy shapes possess,
 As thick and numberless
 As the gay motes that people the sun beams,
 Or likest hovering dreams,
 The fickle pensioners of Morpheus' train.

IL PENSEROSO.

Thirdly. Demetrius and the craftsmen, in opposing Paul and his companions, exemplify the papal priesthood in opposing the Bible Society. Acts, 19. "Our craft is in danger," said Demetrius and his colleagues; "therefore down Paul and Christianity! and up Diana of the Ephesians, and the accompanying rites of idolatry!" "Our craft is in danger," say the pope and the priesthood; "therefore death, a speedy death to the Bible Society! and life, long life to popery, to the multiform gain of imposture, to the loaves and fishes of corruption!" The Bible Society is indirectly and mediately against the kirk of Rome, and therefore the kirk of Rome is decidedly and obstinately against the Bible Society.

Fourthly. For edification of the christian reader, I here quote a part of the Bull of his holiness, or unholiness, pope Leo XII against the Bible Society. "You are aware, venerable brethren, that a certain Society, called the *Bible Society*, strolls with effrontery throughout the world; which Society, contemning the traditions of the Holy Fathers, and contrary to the well known decree of the Council of Trent, labors with all its might, and by every means, to translate, or rather to pervert, the Holy Bible into the vulgar languages of every nation; from which proceeding it is greatly to be feared, that what is ascertained to have happened as to some passages, may also occur with regard to others; to wit, "that by a perverse interpretation, the Gospel of Christ be turned into a human Gospel, or what is still worse, into the *Gospel of the Devil*." To avert this plague, our predecessors published many ordinances; and in his latter days, Pius VII of blessed memory, sent two briefs * * * to show how noxious this most wicked novelty is to both faith and morals. We also, venerable brethren, in conformity with our apostolic duty, exhort you to turn away your flock by all means from these *poisonous pastures*."

To the above quotation I append a part of the address from the Irish papal bishops to their clergy and people, on account of the Bull of Leo. "On receiving this letter, replete with truth and wisdom, * * * we exclaimed, *Peter has spoken by Leo.* * * * As to the books which are distributed by the Bible Society, under the names of Bibles or Testaments, as they treat of religion, and are not sanctioned by us, or by any competent authority in the Catholic Church, the use, the perusal, the reading, or retaining of them, is entirely and without any exception, prohibited to you."*

Article 3. The Unknown Tongue, or the public use of the Latin language in the papal kirk, might, according to natural and logical order, be taken into consideration here, the unknown tongue being a very effective mean of keeping the Bible from the people, and of keeping them ignorant of its holy light. Being however a very important point, and one whereon I have a pretty deal to write, it cannot conveniently be handled here, therefore it will form an independent section.

Article 4. Implicit faith. Implicit faith of the people in the priesthood, of the popular many in the priestal few, is a regular consequence of making the Bible a forbidden book. When the people are universally ignorant of God's word, when they are hindered from reading the holy page of divine wisdom, and from acquiring the most utile and ennobling knowledge, they must depend on the wisdom and knowledge of other folk, and take their opinion wholly from the priesthood. They are also papally commanded so to do. Popery requires one to believe the bare assertion, to credit the mere *ipse dixit* of a priest; to see with the eye, to hear with

* The above two quotations are taken from Groser's "Six Lectures on Popery," a valuable work, and one that may be read with advantage.

the ear, to think with the understanding of the priesthood; to read the Bible, and employ one's reason mediately, by deputy, through the priestly few, they reading and reasoning for one! Kind and obliging men! The people, we are told, are to believe the *Church*. But believing the church, is believing the pope and papal priesthood; for the pope and priesthood, quite independently on the people, determine the doctrine of the church. Papal priests are to lay down the law; and we are to gape, and to swallow all their affirmation, scriptural or unscriptural, reasonable or unreasonable, right or wrong! To read the Bible for one's self, or think for one's self, is deemed heresy, or a thing nearly as bad, by the kirk of Rome, the great whore, Rev. 17: 1, the corrupter of christianity, and the incubus of christendom. The pope and Roman priesthood virtually say to the soul or mind of the people, "Bow down, that we may go over." Isa. 51: 23.

What papal folk term *implicit faith*, appears to be of a twofold kind. 1st. When the implicit believer ignores the proof or evidence of the doctrine he believes. 2d. When he ignores the doctrine itself, even the very name, being ignorant of the nature, names, and number of his doctrines! The second kind perhap is the more perfect of the two, being the more implicit. Now of course, their implicit faith is a mere nominal or imputative (rather imputable) faith, is no more than believing by proxy, is no real faith or belief at all. According to them, one can believe every thing, and yet know nothing! one can believe every truth revealed in the Bible, without knowing any thing of any one truth there! Implicit faith has been comically termed *fides carbonaria* or coaly faith, from being the faith of an ignorant collier. Some one, whom I will call Inquirer, desired to examine a collier concerning his creed or doctrinal belief, when the following conversation ensue-

red. Inquirer. "What do you believe?" Collier. "I believe what the church believes." I. "What does the church believe?" C. "The church believes what I believe." I. "What do you and the church both believe?" C. "The church and I both believe—the same thing!"

Now, reader, what think you of the pretty scrap of Popery, implicit faith? Can you avoid exclaiming, with strong and virtuous indignation, "What abominable folly and fraud are here!" The wise man declares, "That the soul be without knowledge it is *not* good." Prov. 19 : 2. The papal priesthood virtually declare, that the soul be without knowledge is good, very good, not indeed for his salvation, but for our carnal elevation, for our corrupt loaves and fishes, for our usurped dominion over the soul, body and estate of the popular many. "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge." Hos. 4 : 6. And the papal priesthood have been wholesale destroyers, having had little knowledge themselves, and having allowed less or none to the people. "My people are gone into captivity, because they have no knowledge." Isa. 5 : 13. And they were driven thither by the knowledge-hating priesthood of Rome. According to Popery, the people are to have not a reasonable and lively faith in the Lord, but an implicit faith in the priesthood; not a faith purifying the heart, Acts, 15 : 9, working by love, Gal. 5 : 6, and overcoming the world, 1 John, 5 : 4, but a faith perverting the principle, operating by ignorance, and overturning the rationally religious connection between man and his Maker. They are to have a faith consisting with ignorance and immorality, depriving God of an intelligent, rational, scriptural, and holy worshipper; and making the laic an ignoble and miserable slave, and the cleric a guilty and unprincipled tyrant. May the Lord deliver and comfort the injured, and humble and forgive the injurer, and save

them both with an everlasting salvation! But in order to be saved, or to find pardon, the papal and priestal deluder must repent, or turn from his deceptive and cruel doing; be kind and loving to man, lowly and penitent before God, good in himself, and an example of goodness to his neighbor.

Subsection III. Prohibition of books and Index Expurgatorius. Who has not heard of the *index expurgatorius*, that vile, tyrannical, and dark engine of papal Rome for prohibiting books, keeping off knowledge and light, and upholding the empire of ignorance and darkness, of mental and moral night? Books of a utile and instructive kind are not to be read by the people; are carefully kept from the head and hand of the laity, in order that they may not learn the bad doing of the priesthood; may not become aware and informed of the unreasonable, unscriptural, immoral, despotical speaking and acting of the clergy. Any book tending to open the eyes of the public, and to expose the corrupt conduct and unjust domineering of the papal and priestal lords, was rabidly forbidden; and then wo to the wight with whom it was found! All books giving right information, and tending to form correct opinion on ecclesiastical and political affairs, were not allowed to be read; all that would feed the intellect, illumine and enlarge the soul, and enable mankind to know their right, and the proper way of acquiring and retaining it, were doomed to the gloomy ban of the *index*.

But though Popery prohibits books, it prohibits not all. It puts the ban or a formal stigma on the good or utile one, but allows the popular perusal of the inutile and hurtful. Works that tend to rivet their chain, the people may read; books adapted to make them more passive in slavery, and more obedient to the pope or priest, they may read, mark, and learn. They are to read lying legends, and fabulous lives of real or pre-

tended saints. They may pore over stupid tales of monkery, feigned and false account of monks and nuns, men and women who are often idle, ignorant, and immoral. They may read what will not make them wiser, but perhaps confirm them in folly; what will not make them better, but may make them worse. In fine, the people ask for bread, and the priesthood gave them a stone; the former begged a fish, and the latter gave a serpent. Matthew, 7.

Subsection IV. Persecution has been largely employed as a papal medium for preserving the purity of the faith, and for guarding the people from the inroad of heresy! The continual liability to be burnt, or otherwise judicially murdered for heterodoxy, is a wonderful expedient for keeping people orthodox! Torturing the body will enlighten the soul! Inflicting cruel blows on the material part will inject correct opinions into the mind! By wounding without, you put wisdom within! Oh notable discovery of the persecutor and inquisitor! Oh marvellous invention of the pope and the devil! Outward and cruel coercion cannot cause either conviction in the head or conversion in the heart. But yet papal persecution and the infernal inquisition have been ready at hand to oppose the beneficent reign, and even the very being of knowledge, and to maintain the dreary dominion of ignorance or mental night. If people would know, would read the Bible or other utile books, they were soon reminded of their *heresy*, and were speedily handed over to the diabolical dealing of persecution and the inquisitorial arm. See *Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, an admirable work, and one well worthy to be read by all.

Persecution, however, is a subject whereinto I do not formally and fully enter here, not entering, on a two-fold account. 1st. Persecution is not confined in its application to the support of ignorance, of the forbidding of

the Bible, and of the prohibiting of other utile books, but has a wider range, supporting the other papal doctrines, or aiding Popery in general. Persecution has been an ever-present argument for proving the orthodoxy of the whole papal system. 2d. Persecution belongs strictly and properly not to popery, as taken or viewed in the present chapter, but to popery as lording over the state, and wielding the civil sword; for it belongs less to popery doctrinal than to popery political. Persecution appertains, in a mode proper and peculiar, to the peculiar and overgrown *politikirkality** of popery, to its invasion of the right of the civil magistrate, to its absorption of the political into the ecclesiastical, making the state to depend on the kirk, and to be the kirk's servant, slave, and executioner; or compelling the king or magistrate to carry into effect its cruel decision, and to perform all its wicked will. Therefore persecution appertains fully to popery when the word popery is taken in a meaning very long and very broad; in a meaning implying all the politikirkal, the sword, the fire, and the infernal inquisition; the pope being the politikirkalian immoderate and intolerant. N. B. For the meaning here given to popery, see chapter second, section I.

SECTION VI.

UNKNOWN TONGUE, OR LATIN THE GENERAL LANGUAGE OF POPERY.

Subsection I. Article 1. With little inquiry we shall find that the papal use of the unknown tongue, or unin-

* The word *politikirkality* comes from political and kirk, and means political churchism or kirkism. Moreover, the words *politikirkal*, *politikirkalian*, and the like, come from the same original.

telligible medium, is in complete opposition to reason, to the Bible, to the conduct of the writers of the New Testament, to that of the pure and early christian kirk, and to that of the old Hebrew kirk or system.

Firstly. Using the unknown tongue is in complete opposition to reason. 1st. Mediatly. The reasons proving that the Bible ought to be read, do mediatly and consequentially prove that it ought to be in the known or vulgar tongue; for it cannot be read if it be not in a known tongue. In order to be read it must be in a tongue known to the reader. See section last, S. II. article 1, where six reasons are given for reading the Bible. 2nd. Immediately. To the question, What good grounds are found in reason or philosophical propriety, for conducting the worship of God in a tongue unknown to the people; in a tongue that is to the hearer "as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal?" 1 Cor. 13 : 1, one may answer, None at all, no good ground at all. Only think of British protestants conducting their religious service in Chinese! Imagine the British House of Commons carrying on their debate in Hebrew or Arabic! Fancy the lawyers in London pleading in the language of Iceland or Japan, in a language unknown to the judge, the jury, and the spectators! Conceit a public meeting in London, Paris, or Rome, held to take measures for preventing cholera, or for guarding from fire, debating the point in Sanscrit or Coptic! Scripture, prayer, and sermon, in an unknown tongue, are about as unsatisfactory to the intellect, as meat and drink merely drawn on paper, merely painted or pencilled, are to the stomach. The former are sound without sense, and the latter are color without substance. Can one remove hunger by a paper pie or a painted plum-pudding? No. How then can one content, feed, and improve the soul by a word without an idea; by a sign signifying nothing; by language that stops in the ear, entering not the mind?

If man were a mere material machine, he might be addressed in any manner ; in Latin or Greek, Teutonic or Slavonic, Patagonian or Hottentotonian ; by the barking of a hound, the chattering of an ape, the bleating of a sheep, or the braying of a donkey. Man, however, having a soul, a mind, a something that will think and feel, he requires better treatment, demanding to have his understanding illumined, and his reason employed, claiming to be viewed, not as a low sort of brute, but as an inferior kind of angel.

Secondly. Using the unknown tongue, is in complete opposition to the Bible. 1st. Mediatly. The Biblic passages proving that the Bible ought to be read, do mediatly and consequentially prove that it ought to be in the known or vulgar tongue. See under *Firstly*. 2nd. Immediately. The apostle Paul appears, in Cor. 14, to have had a prophetic eye on the preposterous plan of the kirk of Rome, the custom of reading the Bible and praying, if not preaching, in an unknown tongue : and gives an anticipatory condemnation thereof. Read the whole chapter. Moreover, the gift of tongues by the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, Acts 2, is a clear indication of the Divine will that people shall be addressed in a language that they understand ; and therefore is a clear condemnation of the papal scheme. Moreover, a remarkable passage of the Old Testament is in direct opposition to the plan of the kirk of Rome. " They read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." Nehemiah, 8 : 8.

Thirdly. Using the unknown tongue, is in complete opposition to the conduct of the writers of the New Testament. The writers of the New Testament employed the Greek tongue, writing in the language then more known than any other in the civilized world. Now the adoption by the inspired penmen, of the Greek, the lan-

guage then most widely spread and most commonly understood, is a very strong argument in opposition to the papal plan of shutting up the Bible and Prayers in an unknown tongue.

Fourthly. Using the unknown tongue, is in complete opposition to the conduct of the pure and early christian kirk. 1st. Early kirk of Rome. The conduct of the corrupt kirk of Rome, during many centuries, has been in direct and palpable opposition to that of the pure and early kirk of Rome. Soon after the christian era the Roman kirk adopted a Latin version of Scripture, using it in public and in private, in the temple and the dwelling. And it preferred the Latin translation to the inspired original, because Latin was the language of the Italian people, and well understood by Italian christians, and Greek and Hebrew were not. The pure and early Roman christians thought it better to employ a fallible version that they knew or understood, than to use the infallible original, whereof they were ignorant, preferring a tongue known to a tongue unknown. And they judged well and wisely. Modern Rome however prefers a tongue unknown to a tongue known; preferring Latin, a dead language now, to Italian in Italy, to French in France, to Spanish in Spain, and the like. The antient kirk of Rome used Latin, because the living language then; the modern kirk, acting contrarily to the antient, will not use Italian and the like, though the living languages now. The former took intelligible Latin, and herein did right; the latter will not take intelligible Italian, and herein does wrong. The former preferred the uninspired Latin to the inspired Greek and Hebrew, and was right; the latter will not prefer the uninspired Italian to the uninspired Latin, and must be very and extremely wrong. For the former had more reason for keeping to the Greek and Hebrew original, that being inspired and therefore infallible;

than the latter has for keeping to the Latin version, that being uninspired and therefore fallible. Now bearing in mind that the antient kirk of Rome rejected the public use of the infallible original, because unintelligible to the people, for that of a fallible version that was intelligible to them, and that the modern kirk of Rome will not reject the public use of one fallible version that is become unintelligible for that of another not more fallible, that is understood by all, we find the two kirks pulling in a contrary direction, not indeed in relation to the dead letter, but in relation to the spirit, the vitality, the main and essential part of religion. In regard to the soul or substance, to the head and the heart, the modern Roman kirk acts in a way directly opposite to that of the antient; the antient having spoken to the mind, and tried to subject man to the government of God; and the modern speaking to the ear, and trying to bring man under the rule of the priesthood. The one would have christians in nature, the other will have them in name; the one desired a christian freeman, the other longs for a papal slave. Therefore the one used a tongue known, and the other employs a tongue unknown and inutile.

2nd. Other early kirks. All other early or primitive christian kirks took good care to have the Bible translated into the known or popular tongue, the language of the people. East and west, north and south, the early christians had and read the holy volume in their own well known tongue. They were utterly opposed to locking up the word of God in a dead and barren language, or to keeping the Bible concealed from the people at large.

Fifthly. Using the unknown tongue, is in complete opposition to the conduct of the old Hebrew kirk or system. The practice of the old Hebrew kirk was directly opposed to that of the kirk of Rome. First. The Holy Scripture was in Hebrew, the known and vernacular tongue of the people. Second. After the return

from Babylon, when the pure Hebrew language was not known to all, care was taken to make the revealed will of God known to all, by translating from the pure Hebrew, into the language more popularly known. Means were employed to enable the people to know the meaning of the Divine record, and to understand the words of eternal life. See Nehem. 8:8.

Article 2. It is worth while to inquire the corrupt motive the papal kirk has for being in love with the singularly absurd and cruel custom of speaking only to the outward ear, by using the Latin language, a custom at war with common sense and good feeling. Without pretending to mention all the motives, I will mention five.

1st. To keep the people ignorant, and therefore dependent on the priesthood. "Ignorance is the mother of popery, ay, and the daughter too; ignorance being of popery, both mother and daughter, cause and effect." See section last.

2d. To have a bond of union between the many priests, binding all the members of the priesthood in one huge confederation, in one great alliance, one mighty league, in one body wieldy, tractable, governable; a body separate and apart from the people, alien to the laity in language and interest, and opposite and hostile to popular right, and the spread and dominion of liberty.

3d. To bind the different sees to the see of Rome. Latin being the antient language of Rome, the adoption of Latin as the general and official language of a kirk, marks the kirk with an implicit subjection to the kirk of Rome, making it a part and parcel of the kingdom of the Beast.

4th. To enable the priesthood to be ignorant of living languages.

5th. To cause the Vulgate version of the Bible, the favorite translation of the kirk of Rome, and that is in Latin, to be more authoritative in the eye of the Bible

reader, and more exclusively entitled to veneration and regard.

Subsection II. If religious improvement and general utility, instead of corruption, carnality, and special interest, were the grand object pursued by the papal kirk or papal court, it would adopt the Greek for its official language, in preference to the Latin. To prove that the Greek deserved to be taken rather than the Latin, I will give six reasons.

Reason first. Greek is the original language of the New Testament, the more important of the two grand divisions of the Bible. Therefore making Greek the general language of the kirk, would tend directly to make the New Testament generally known, and so lead to the diffusion and well-being of Christianity. Real or pure Christianity, however, was not the great end that the papal kirk had in view.

Reason second. Greek gives access to a very good antient version of the Old Testament, the Greek version of the Seventy, called the Septuagint. This is a leading antique version of the Old Testament, both in time and in truth. See Section III, Subsection II, point fourth.

Reason third. Greek literature in general is decidedly superior to the Latin, the intellectual treasure of Greece preponderating that of Rome. Greek philosophy and Greek poetry are superior to their rivals in the old Latin tongue; and in other particulars, the Greek remains are not inferior to the Latin.

Reason fourth. Greek has never ceased or failed to be a living language. 1st. It was the language, more or less, of the Lower, Eastern, Constantinoplan empire. 2d. It has ever been the language of Greece proper. I know that modern Greek differs somedeal from antient; but even if it differ very much, if it differ in particulars very many and very great, it is yet fundamen-

tally and essentially the same language. And do I hope that the literary public, and the government of modern Greece, will take good care to reject the modern innovation and barbarism, and to recur to the noble Greek of antiquity. If they can make antient Greek better, let them do so; but let them neither make it worse, nor alter it for the sake of mere alteration.

Reason fifth. Greek is a better language than Latin. It may not have the pomp, the majesty of the Latin; it may be in this point inferior to its rival; but it is superior in at least four other points. 1st. It is more musical. 2nd. It is more copious. 3rd. It is more flexible. 4th. It is more precise. In what point beside melody, fertility, flexibility, and precision, it goes beyond the Latin, I do not presume to affirm. But I do affirm (what indeed is very well known) that it clearly outdoes the Latin on the whole.

Reason sixth. Greek is more original than Latin in three ways. 1st. The Greek tongue lends largely to the Latin, and borrows very little in return, being one of the main fountains of the Latin tongue, and deriving herefrom few Greek words. 2nd. The Greek tongue being earlier than the Latin, having been formed afore it, goes farther back into antiquity, lying nearer the grand original, the primal or radical language of all, the language of Adam and Eve, the Hebrew, if Hebrew be what I presume it to be, the great original, the fountain-head, the parent of the numerous lingual family. 3rd. The Greek tongue, I apprehend, owes less to other tongues, is less derivative, more primitive, more fully formed from things in nature, from external and internal phenomena than the Latin.

Subsection III. Why was not the Greek taken, instead of the Latin, for the medium of communication between literary men, for the common language of the learned world? That it ought to have been so taken, appears

tolerably clear from the six reasons given in the last subsection. Unless reasons equally strong can be found on the side of the Latin, I shall think the Greek deserved to be chosen as the lingual organ of the republic of letters. Why then was Greek disregarded in favor of Latin?

A leading reason on behalf of Latin was, unquestionably, the following: Latin having been the leading language of the Roman empire, became, by natural consequence, by the operation of political and geographical event, the grand original of the language of many of the nations whereinto the empire became divided. On the invasion and dissolution of the empire by the northern barbarian, the Latin, the language of the conquered, was mingled with the language of the conqueror; and being altered and corrupted by the northern hordes, served for the foundation of the language of Italy, Spain, France, and the like. Latin corrupted by the Heruli, the Goth, the Lombard, and others, went to form Italian. Latin corrupted by the Goth, the Moor, and others, went to form Spanish. Latin corrupted by the Goth, the Frank, and others, went to form French. Thus in Italian, Spanish, and French, the grand essential, the principal ingredient, the main body, is Latin. Now Latin being the great fountain of several modern European tongues, had some claim to be taken for the learned language of Europe. N. B. I am aware that some critics do not deem Latin to be the grand essential or main body of Italian and the like. They deem Latin to be not the major part, but the minor one, judging Gothic or the like to be the main fountain or the foundation. Without pretending to be a good authority on the lingual point, I incline to the opinion that I have given, namely, that Latin is the major part, and not the minor one. Perhaps, however, the two opposing opinions may meet half-way, the Latin being taken for half of.

the Italian, being neither a superior nor an inferior fountain to the Gothic, but an equal one.

I have omitted to mention Portuguese, though Portuguese, too, comes from the Latin. My reason for the omission is, that Portuguese nearly resembles Spanish, the two being dialects of one and the same tongue, rather than two and different tongues.

An additional reason in favor of the Latin claim to the high honor of being the literary language, is derived from the part taken by the Latin in the formation of the language of England. We Britons have drawn largely from the Latin spring; so largely as to make Latin one of the two main fountains, the second original of our language; the two great originals of our noble tongue being Saxon and Latin. Two grand political events tended jointly to make the Latin contribute abundantly toward the composition of the English. 1st. The Roman conquest. The Romans, however, appear not to have been able to make their language take root in our isle so widely and deeply as in Hispania and Gaul; therefore the retirement of the Roman legions was followed by the departure, politically, nationally, generally, of the Roman language. 2nd. The French conquest under William of Normandy. This great event brought the Latin to our shore a second time, though in a manner circuitous, indirect, or mediate. Now Latin being perhaps the second original of our tongue, French maybe is the third. It follows that the first, second, and third fountain of our fine language, taken in the order of importance or quantity, are, maybe, Saxon, Latin, French.

Nations, that in forming their own tongue, borrowed from the Latin because it had been taken as the learned language, might, in like manner, borrow from the Greek, had Greek been taken as the language of the learned public. Therefore borrowing from the Latin merely because it had been taken as the tongue of the learned, is

no natural or original reason in favor of the claim of the Latin to be so taken; for if the Greek had been taken instead, Greek would be, so far, the lingual bank whence we should borrow. Whatever tongue is taken as the learned one, becomes hereby a fountain wherefrom other tongues draw.

I am wandering, however, from Popery, and am beginning to meddle with matters that lie somewhat aloof from my proper and natural path of mental exertion. Therefore I quit the consideration of lingual affairs, leaving them to the discussion and decision of a Crichton, a Bentley, a Selden, and other names of like renown.

SECTION VII.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

Subsection I. We have here a huge and overgrown monster, a mere bulk of deformity in the eye of reason. Papal folk pretend that, in the Lord's Supper, the bread and wine are really and truly changed, by the act of consecration, into the flesh and blood, the human body of Jesus Christ! Reasonable and Scriptural reader; do I commit a wrong in calling the doctrine a monster? Hear a learned and leading cardinal. Drelincourt relates that cardinal Perron, being asked by some of his friends, in his last sickness, what he thought of Transubstantiation, replied, "It is a *Monster*."

I opine that papites hardly mean that the bread and wine are turned, in consecration, not only into our Lord's Body, but even into His Body, Soul, and Divinity! I take their theory to be, that the bread and wine

become converted into the mere body, and by the conversion, become peculiarly joined to the soul and divinity. As I understood their incredible whim, the soul and divinity become present in the eucharist, not because they are made from the bread and wine, but because they are inseparably connected with the body that is made therefrom.

According to popery, the Soul of our Lord, in the eucharist, is present to the body, there being both body and soul. In holding the soul to be present, papistes are right on several accounts, whereof I will mention two 1st. The body and soul ought to be together. Where should the body be, but about and around the soul? And where should the soul be, but in the body? The body and soul are proper and natural companions. 2d. Any bread and wine body does not become a body of our Lord, without or afore a junction to his soul, a junction made after consecration. Without being then joined to his soul, the body is not properly his body. A number of particles of matter, however put together, however framed and figured, that had never been joined to my soul, could not well be called my body. Whatever the shape or figure, the body can hardly be termed my body till it is joined to my soul. A set of material particles do not rightly constitute a body of any one, because of a mere special arrangement or organization, for there ought to be a connection with the soul or mind. It follows that any given bread and wine that have never been our Lord's body, cannot well become so, without becoming formally and finally joined to his soul. Therefore in order that the sacramental elements may become a proper body of our Lord, his soul must be there, and be peculiarly joined to them after consecration. The bread and wine being turned not into the old body of our Lord, but into a new body, the soul must become newly present to it, ere it can become his body

properly and fully. N. B. I here presume that the bodies of our Lord are different bodies, and not the same body; and that, at the time of consecration, they have not been joined to the soul. The point will be proved in Subsection II, Argument third.

According to popery, the Divinity of our Lord, in the eucharist, is present to the body and soul, there being body, soul, and divinity.

Subsection II. In opposition to the extravagant, puerile, barbarian conceit, the preposterous and absurd vagary of Transubstantiation, I offer the following eighteen arguments.

Argument first. The doctrine is opposed to every one of the five senses; not to one or two only, but to all. It is opposite and contradictory to seeing, feeling, tasting, smelling, hearing; is at irreconcilable enmity with eyes, hands, palate, nose, ears. Moreover, it has opposed and contradicted the senses not only once, or twice, or few times, but millions, billions, trillions of times, even during the very long term of eighteen hundred years, and throughout the whole extent of the christian world, everywhen and everywhere; or not merely of A, B, or C, or of one man, woman, or child, but of the whole alphabet, or of every man, woman, and child who have been connected with the eucharist. The doctrine has contravened the five senses in all christian time, and in all christendom; or in other words, of all people concerned. Heaven help one to escape from the doctrinal monster. Had we no eye to see, no hand to feel, no mouth to taste, no nose to smell, no ear to hear, I know not what reception we might give to transubstantiation! but having the five senses all complete, we are bound either to disallow the hideous papal phantasma, or to throw aside the *common sense*, hurling rationality to Eolus and the wind. If the five senses deceive and mislead in one case, they de-

serve no credit in any other case ; if they tell one that flesh and blood are bread and wine, they are liars, impostors, and knaves, and merit no belief in their testimony. Behold us, then, at open war with our five senses, our five natural guides, our five leaders in relation to external things, to the material world without and around ! What are we then to do ? I will tell you, if you will tell me what a ship is to do in the open ocean, without sail, ballast, helm, compass, sun, moon, or star. All hail to the happy day of scepticism, Pyrrhonism, universal doubt ! All hail to Berkeley who would have no matter, and to Hume who would have no mind ; to the Idealism of the former, and to the *Impressionism* of the latter !* All hail to ignorance, to folly, to chaos, to confusion ! Moreover, all thank to the pope and priesthood of Rome, for by them we learn that we need not believe the evidence of our senses when they give unfavorable testimony. Do a man's senses tell him that he is exposed, on an open down and in a dark night, to cold, and wind, and rain ? Let him instanter become a papite, and lo, he may instanter find himself laid in a warm bed, snugly wrapped in pillow, sheet, and quilt ! Man, tell thy senses they are fools or false reporters. Is a poor child crying through nakedness and hunger ? Popery will say that the back is well clad, and the belly well crammed. Many think, according to the senses, the fallacious five, that they live on poor fare ; while, according to papal wisdom, they may be faring sumptuously every day. A poor Hibernian's palate says the dinner is potatoes, a priest will tell him 'tis a rich plum pudding. A miserable starveling using all the five senses, the false five, can find nothing on the table but

* I remark, in passing, that I am an enemy to the peculiar metaphysical theory of both metaphysicians here named, of the bright and benevolent soul of Berkeley, and of the dark and dire spirit of Hume.

sorry *soupe maigre*; the pope can tell him that he is really feasting and luxuriating on a fat sirloin. But how knows the priest better than the Irishman? and how is the pope wiser than the starveling? Their reverend selves are hand in hand, and cheek by jole with infallibility! Wonderful arrangement of the papal kirk! She takes away the five senses, and gives, in return, infallibility. Admirable casuistry! happy compensation! beautiful exchange!

———Exchange
Is held no robbery.

UNKNOWN.

deem it right to remark that our blessed Lord plainly and directly taught men to rely on the certainty of sense, to depend on the testimony of sight, feeling and the like, and thereby condemned, indirectly, and consequentially, the monster transubstantiation which requires men to reject the testimony of sense as an uncertain or deceptive thing. "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." Luke, 24:39. Now only submit the doctrine of Transubstantiation to our Lord's own test: we ask no more.

Argument second. According to transubstantiation, Christ's one body is at once in many places, in ten, or in a million, or in ten million! or else he has at once many bodies, ten, or a million, or ten million! For according to the consummate piece of foolery, his human nature can be, at one and same time, in every nation, province, county, hundred, parish, town, and village upon the globe; as in all the places can be a priest performing, at one and same time, the miracle of changing bread and wine into flesh and blood. Oh egregious ignorance! Oh exquisite folly!

Argument third. According to the gross and stupid

scheme, our Lord's one body has been made, and then destroyed, eaten and drunk, millions or billions of times, and in many places at one time! or else he has had millions, or billions, or trillions of bodies made, and then destroyed, eaten and drunk! The Eucharist has been performed millions or billions of times, and in many places at one time, or in one, few, or many places at every time, since the christian era; and at every time, the same body of our Saviour, in one, few, or many places, or else one, few, or many new bodies of him, have been made, and then destroyed, eaten and drunk!

I here presume that, if one body be not held sufficient for all cases, it is not held so for more than one case; and therefore that a separate body is found for every separate case, whether it be place or time, one body not serving either for two places or for two times. Possibly however a papal wiseacre may hold that, though different places require different bodies, different times require but one body, one body sufficing for only one place, but for all times. Whatever (or whether) mode of folly be held, the scope, marrow, and spirit of the argument remain in full power.

Our Lord has had millions, or billions, or trillions of bodies made, and then destroyed, eaten and drunk! The bodies must all be different, every host being different from every other, and from the Son of Mary, from him who was born of the virgin, and who died on the cross, and who is now glorified at the right hand of Jehovah. That the bodies are different bodies, and not the same body, will be clear from the following two reasons. 1st. One and same body cannot be in two or more places, at one and same time. 2nd. The bodies are made of different particles of matter, or from different portions of bread and wine. The particles of matter constituting any eucharistical bread and wine, are different from the particles constituting any other; and

the two sets of particles being different, and not same, the two breads and two wines are different, and not same. Therefore the host or body made of one set of particles, or one bread and wine, is different from the host or body made of another set of particles, or another bread and wine. And any host or body differs radically both from every other host or body, and from the Son of the Virgin Mary. A host or bread and wine body, not being born of Mary, cannot be her son. Different cannot be same, therefore many different bodies cannot be one and same body.

Argument fourth. At the supper directly afore the crucifixion, Jesus Christ had *two bodies*; one that was perceptible and plain to the senses of the apostles, and wherein his human soul was lodged, and that he had had from his birth, and another that he held in his hand, between his thumb and forefinger perhap! The second body of his, he *ate and drank*! that is, he ate and drank his own body! and killed himself! though remaining alive! Either he killed himself, or he ate and drank both his body and his soul! Indeed, according to papal orthodoxy, our Lord ate and drank his body, his soul, and his Divinity! Moreover, our Saviour with his own hands, gave away himself, body, soul, and divinity, to every one of his disciples, to be eaten and drunk! and yet kept himself to himself! Oh contemptible, monstrous, and abominable absurdity and profanity!

Argument fifth. If the bread and wine be really flesh and blood, the flesh and blood are often asunder, many feet or yards apart, one being on a plate, and the other in a cup! Indeed the two parts of the live body, the flesh and blood, can be in two rooms, or in two buildings, or even half a mile one from the other! The same living body can be partly here, and partly there; the flesh and blood of one and same living man being,

at one and same moment, one in St. Paul's and the other in Westminster Abbey! The body can be divided into two parts, the solid and the fluid, and the solid can be carried to Dublin, while the fluid is left in London, and yet the man continue alive and well! Seven Wonders of the world, hide your diminished heads! for ye are wonders no longer!

Argument sixth. To avoid many and great objections, papal folk affirm that, in offering Christ, the flesh is not broken or torn, and the blood is not spilled. They give the following reason: "There is whole and entire Christ under the element of bread, and under every particle of it; and under the element of wine, and under every drop of it." According to my view of the reason they give, the body of Christ is not divided, broken, spilled by the dividing, breaking, spilling of the bread and wine, because every particle of one, and every drop of the other, either is or becomes separately a whole and entire Christ! Now on their affirmation and reason taken together, I proceed to make two comments.

Comment 1st. There are, sooner or latter, as many whole Christs as there are particles of bread and drops of wine. A man of plain wit would deem two whole Christs, one for the bread and one for the wine, to be one too many. But he would be a mere bungler or ignaro, if not a heretic; for there is a whole and entire Christ for every particle of bread, and for every drop of wine! Now supposing the bread to be divided into one thousand particles, and the wine into one thousand drops, we shall have not only one whole and entire Christ, but exactly 2000! And by more dividing and subdividing, we may have more Christs—*ad infinitum*! Papistes may not like my inference about the plurality and multitude of Christs; but how will they prove it illogical, or unfairly drawn?

Comment 2d. Is the plurality of Christs afore the division of the bread and wine, or only after? If afore, transubstantiation made not only one Christ, but perhap two thousand, or double, or treble the number, or even many more. If not afore, but only after, we have four wonders. 1st. A far smaller miracle was done by transubstantiating, than is done by dividing; the former having made but one Christ, and the latter making an innumerable number. 2d. Moreover, the bread and wine may be divided, broken, spilled by a mere heretic or infidel, and with a mere jerk of the hand or blow of the foot; and therefore a heretic or infidel, with a jerk or blow, may make a multitude of Christs! 3d. The many or after-Christs are made, not from the bread and wine, but from the one original Christ. The bread and wine having been made, by transubstantiation, into one Christ, the many subsequent Christs cannot be made from them, but must be made from that Christ whereinto they had been made. 4th. Either the one primitive Christ was unmade or destroyed in the making of the many derivative ones, or he remains with them, he and they existing together or co-existing. Assuming the former, we have the destruction of Christ, or of a Christ! Assuming the latter, we find that the one primal Christ, though continuing one, has become, by division, many, perhap one million, being at once one whole and entire Christ, and yet one million whole and entire Christs! And the whole being equal to the parts, the one primitive Christ ought to be equal to the one million derivative ones!

Argument seventh. If the monster doctrine be true, every papal priest often works a miracle, namely, that of turning bread and wine into flesh and blood. Every papal priest, however ignorant and stupid, however wicked and immoral, however covered with crime, guilt, and infamy, however remote and far from holi-

ness and God, every such man is a real miracle-monger, and may perform a miracle when and where he likes, having a kind of *carte blanche* from God in his pocket to make a Lord Jesus Christ !

Argument eighth. A bread and wine man, or rather a bread and wine *something*, not being born of a woman, is *nonhuman*,—not of woman born, not properly of humankind. To be born of woman is a characteristic of the whole human family, excepting him who is imagined to be made from bread and wine ; therefore he is quite different from the whole human family, or is nonhuman. N. B. Adam and Eve were unavoidable exceptions to the rule of being born of woman. Being the first man and woman, the two human originals, the primal pair, they could not possibly come into the world in the ordinary way of natural birth ; therefore they came from the creative hand of Jehovah, directly and immediately.

The primary couple excepted, whoever comes not from or through Eve or her female posterity, is to be deemed nonnatural and nonhuman, as coming in a way not necessary, not required by nature, and not according to the law of human propagation.

Argument ninth. Papites, according to the nonsensical notion, the ridiculous whim of Transubstantiation, are man-eaters, cannibals, anthropophagi ; for they feed on human body, eat and drink human flesh and blood !

Argument tenth. The Soul. Firstly. In the foregoing nine arguments we have examined transubstantiation in relation to the body of our Lord ; we have now to view the doctrine in relation to the soul. And having found absurdity where we have gone, we may count upon finding it where we have to go.

Folly upon folly piled
Wisdom being thrown aside.

1st. According to argument first, there is the soul of our Lord, where our five senses can find nothing but bread and wine.

2d. According to argument second, our Lord's one soul is at once in many places, in ten, or in a million, or in ten million! or else he has at once many souls, ten, or a million, or ten million!

3d. According to argument third, our Lord's one soul has left his body millions or billions of times, and in many places at one time! or else he has had millions, or billions, or trillions of souls leaving his body! Either the soul or souls have left the body, or it or they have been eaten and drunk with the body! body and soul having been eaten and drunk together! Jesus Christ having been eaten and drunk alive! If the soul leave the body, our Lord is killed or put to death, the soul being disjoined from the body, and driven away to heaven, or to another body of bread and wine. Moreover, he is killed by his friends, his friends and followers being his foes, and inflicting on him the pain of death, or murdering him! Every priest is a kind of Pilate, and christian priesthood and people resemble the crucifying Jews and Romans! If the soul leave not the body, they are eaten and drunk together! our Lord being swallowed up alive!

4th. According to argument fourth, at the supper directly afore the crucifixion, Jesus Christ had *two souls*, or one soul in two bodies!

5th. According to argument fifth, we shall have no little trouble in finding the soul. Where shall we seek it? Is the soul on the plate, with the bread or flesh? or is it in the cup, with the wine or blood? or is it with neither, but half way between both? Is the soul in St. Paul's, in Westminster Abbey, or at Temple Bar? in Dublin, in London, or swimming about in the intervening channel? Descartes thought to find the soul

snugly sitting on the Pineal gland. Poor Descartes! he did not learn theology at Rome.

6th. According to argument sixth, the souls of our Lord may be a very great multitude! Remember, there is a soul of Christ with every body of him, body and soul being together. If, therefore, by dividing the bread and wine, a priest, or a heretic, or an infidel, or even a devil make 2000 particles and drops together, he makes or brings, or shows that the transubstantiator had made or brought 2000 souls of Christ! And the more crumbling of bread, and the more spilling of wine, the more souls of our Lord!!

7th. According to argument seventh, the papal priesthood, however ignorant and vicious, may make the soul of our Lord go where and when they like. Having a kind of *carte blanche* from God in their pocket to make a Lord Jesus Christ! they can draw his soul to any papal spot on the globe, in any day of the year, ordering it here or there, now or then, having the command of its place and time.

8th. According to argument eighth, the soul of our Lord, being joined to a nonhuman body, is a nonhuman soul.

9th. According to argument ninth, the soul of our Lord is joined to a body that is under the power of man-eaters, cannibals, anthropophagi.

Secondly. According to popery, our Lord does not die when eaten and drunk. Then he is eaten and drunk alive! body and soul being eaten and drunk or swallowed together! body and soul going into the stomach and gastric juice! If Jesus Christ do not die when taken by the communicant in the eucharist, the body and soul continue together and go together, the body being inseparably accompanied by the soul; and the former being eaten and drunk, so is the latter, and therefore so is the whole living man. Jesus Christ is eaten

and drunk alive, or in his whole and entire humanity, or body and soul!

Some may affirm that the body and soul of our Lord go not into our body, but into our soul. I will give two replies. 1st. Our Lord's body and soul go into our body or stomach. It is a matter of fact that the bread and wine, the apparent bread and wine, (the papally pretended real body of Christ,) go into the body or stomach of the communicant. This cannot be denied, without denying evidence and truth. Therefore the soul of Christ, inseparably accompanying his body, must go there too. 2nd. The other theory, namely, that the body and soul of our Lord go into our soul, is equally or even more absurd. How can his *soul* go into our soul? and even if it could, how,—in the name of common reason, how can his *body* go into our soul? That a soul can enter a body, we know; but that a body can enter a soul, is far, very far beyond and above our knowledge. The two theories are greatly absurd, namely, that our Lord's body and soul go into our body, and that they go into our soul. Either way is folly.

We have seen in argument eighth, and in the former part of the present argument, that a eucharistal Jesus Christ has a nonhuman body and a nonhuman soul. We see here that he does not die, but that he is eaten and drunk alive. Moreover, we are told that he does not suffer, that he is free from pain, being impassible. What more?

Argument eleventh. The Divinity. Firstly. I shall write little on this argument, the Divinity being too sacred and awful a theme to be brought forward in debate, without unavoidable necessity. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain."

According to argument first, there is the Divinity of our Lord, where our five senses can find nothing but bread and wine.

If the reader like, he may follow the order of argument tenth or last, and learn how far the method applied there to the soul is applicable here to the Divinity.

Secondly. According to popery, our Lord does not die when eaten and drunk. Then he is eaten and drunk alive! body, soul, and divinity being eaten and drunk or swallowed together! body, soul, and divinity going into the stomach and gastric juice! But how can our Lord whole and entire, his body, soul, and divinity, go into our body or stomach? Can his *whole and entire Divinity* be contained in our finite and little body? No.

Some may affirm that the body, soul, and divinity of our Lord go not into our body, but into our soul. 1st. They go into our body or stomach. 2nd. That they go into our soul is equally or even more absurd. How can our Lord whole and entire, his body, soul and divinity, go into our soul? Can his *whole and entire Divinity* be contained in our finite and little soul? No. See argument tenth or last.

Thirdly. I exclaim, in passing, what an amazing example of folly and profanity do we find in the monster transubstantiation! what a frightful compound of absurdity and blasphemy!

Argument twelfth. Firstly. The monster doctrine cannot be received, because it leads to the ruin of rational christianity, because it goes indirectly to undermine and destroy the logical foundation of the Bible. For it is a weighty and awful truth, that more evidence exists against transubstantiation than for christianity; that stronger argument disproves the former than proves the latter. Therefore sooner than believe that enorm crudity, we are compelled, by reason and logic, to disbelieve the Bible. The grand, the leading argument for christianity, is probably the argument from history; and the grand, the leading argument against transubstantiation, is perhaps the one derived from the opposition of

the five senses. Now the historical argument is less powerful and conclusive than the other; the testimony of historians being less satisfactory than the quintuple testimony of our senses, our five reporting friends. Christianity, I know, does not depend on the evidence of history alone, but has ample collateral proof; and transubstantiation is not opposed by the evidential power of the five senses exclusively, but meets the hostile array of many a concurrent argument. And the collateral proofs for the former are less convincing and effective than the concurrent arguments against the latter. Therefore the combined proof for the entire christian scheme is inferior to the combined proof against the huge papal fiction. Moreover, transubstantiation has no proper evidence of its own, has no real proof independently on christianity; but is strong in her sole and exclusive strength, depending wholly on her evidential power, and living no longer than she lives herself. If christianity fall and die, transubstantiation falls and dies with her. It follows that transubstantiation, having no evidence of its own, and being opposed by evidence greater than what upholds christianity, brings her to destruction, bowing her to the earth, and crushing her to death by its own dead weight. Thus it appears that, if the unwise and unholy papal league between christianity and transubstantiation be not dissolved; if the latter be not disjoined from the former, and thrown aside as an evil thing; if we be driven to the bitter and dreadful alternative either of admitting a doctrine that overturns reason and common sense, plucking them up by the root, or of rejecting christianity in whole, as a system built on sand, and wrongly pretending to come from God; we are bound to reject her. The doctrine being opposed by greater proof than what upholds the christian scheme, and relying wholly on the scheme for support, we are bound, logically bound rather to reject the christian

scheme, than to admit the monster doctrine. The evidence for christianity, though great, manifold, mighty, wonderful, is unable to countervail the greater evidence against transubstantiation; but being the lighter, kicks the beam; being the weaker, flies from the face of its opponent. So Homer makes Hector, the great, heroic, and noble defender of Troy, fly from the favored Achilles.

The mighty fled, by greater might pursued.

ILIAD.

Secondly. The kirk of Rome presumes to derive transubstantiation from christianity; pretends to find the monster hid in a kind of cave formed of the literal meaning of some very few passages of the New Testament. Thus, according to papal presumption and folly, christianity and transubstantiation are related to each other as parent and child, mother and son. The son however reminds one of some deformed or misshapen monster who, in coming into the world, causes the death of his mother, and then dies himself through want of maternal nourishment and care. Transubstantiation is a worse son than Death. Death did not murder his mother Sin, but only subjected her to rape; whereas transubstantiation actually murders his mother Christianity, though in murdering her, he murders himself, being guilty at once of matricide and suicide. Now matricide and suicide being worse than rape, the papal son is worse than the *Miltonian*.—*Par. Lost, Book II.* Transubstantiation christians are, like Samson, self-destroyers; for by adopting transubstantiation, they occasion the destruction of christianity, and therefore destroy themselves as christians. They are not, however, like Samson, destroyers of their enemies. Samson, in killing himself, took care to kill the Philistines. But they, in killing their own christian character, do not kill their foes, namely, sin, the devil, sorrow and death; on the

contrary, they enable their four dire foes to live and prosper more actively and vigorously than afore. These people differ from the Hebrew Hercules (who possibly was the real and original Hercules) in another point, namely, in killing one of their best friends,—Reason. Christianity and Reason are sisters, allies, partners, and stand or fall together. Therefore transubstantiators, in bringing death to Christianity, take away life from Reason. Oh lunacy, insanity, madness! What Bedlam in the wide world contains madmen madder than the mad transubstantiationite? Oh papal errant, how great is your error! how amazing your credulity, how ridiculous your creed!

Argument thirteenth. Allowing transubstantiation, not only we cannot believe, but even they who lived 1800 years ago, and were living witnesses of the miracles, could not fully believe christianity, as they could not believe the miracles. The proof against transubstantiation, is equal or superior to the proof for the miracles; therefore if men can believe the former, they can disbelieve the latter; if they can deem the former to be true, they can deem the latter to be false. Miracles appeal to the senses, and presuppose their certainty. If we believe the miracles, we must disbelieve transubstantiation; if we believe it, we must disbelieve them. We cannot logically believe the two together. With transubstantiation, no miracles; and without miracles, where would be the main external evidence of christianity? Transubstantiation, by overturning the testimony of sense, overturns the evidence of miracles for the truth of christianity, and hereby deprives her of her grand external proof and prop.

"Is it reasonable to imagine that God should make that a part of the christian religion, which shakes the main external evidence and confirmation of the whole? I mean the miracles which were wrought by our Sa-

viour and his apostles, the assurance whereof did at first depend upon the certainty of sense. For if the senses of those who say they saw them were deceived, then there might be no miracles wrought; and consequently it may justly be doubted whether that kind of confirmation which God hath given to the christian religion would be strong enough to prove it, supposing Transubstantiation to be a part of it: because every man hath as great evidence that Transubstantiation is false, as he hath that the christian religion is true. Suppose then Transubstantiation to be part of the christian doctrine, it must have the same confirmation as the whole, and that is miracles: but of all doctrines in the world, it is peculiarly incapable of being proved by a miracle. For if a miracle were wrought for the proof of it, the very same assurance which any man hath of the truth of the miracle, he hath of the falsehood of the doctrine, that is, the clear evidence of his senses. For that there is a miracle wrought to prove, "that what he sees in the sacrament is not bread but the body of Christ," there is only the evidence of sense; and there is the very same evidence to prove, "that what he sees in the sacrament is not the body of Christ, but bread." So that here would arise a new controversy, whether a man should rather believe his senses giving testimony against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or bearing witness to a miracle wrought to confirm that doctrine; there being the very same evidence against the truth of the doctrine which there is for the truth of the miracle; and then the argument for Transubstantiation, and the objection against it, would just balance one another; and consequently Transubstantiation is not to be proved by a miracle, because that would be to prove to a man by something that he sees, that he doth not see what he sees. And if there were no other evidence that Transubstantiation is no part of the christian doctrine, this

would be sufficient, that what proves the one, doth as much overthrow the other ; and that miracles which are certainly the best and highest external proof of christianity, are the worst proof in the world of Transubstantiation, unless a man can renounce his senses at the same time that he relies upon them. For a man cannot believe a miracle without relying upon sense, nor Transubstantiation without renouncing it. So that never were any two things so ill coupled together as the doctrine of christianity and that of Transubstantiation, because they draw several ways, and are ready to strangle one another : for the main evidence of the christian doctrine, which is miracles, is resolved into the certainty of sense, but this evidence is clear and point-blank against Transubstantiation." See *Tillotson, Sermon 26.*

Argument fourteenth. Even if Transubstantiation were true, it would be incapable of proof in any known way of proving, or in other words, it could not well be shown to be a truth.

Firstly. The passages in the New Testament, brought to prove the doctrine, are known to be there by the sense of seeing only ; while the doctrine itself is opposed by every sense. Supposing one sense to tell that a pro-transubstantiation passage is in the Bible ; all the five senses tell that the doctrine is untrue. Whether ought to carry the day, the one or the five ? Undoubtedly the five.

Secondly. Indeed if we heard an apostle or even an angel affirm the doctrine to be true, we should know its truth by the sense of hearing only ; while we should know its falsity by all the five, five senses opposing one.

Thirdly. A miracle would not prove the monster doctrine. The senses that would prove the miracle, would disprove the doctrine ; for if they be trustworthy, and the miracle true, the doctrine must be erroneous,

opposing them. The certainty of sense being supposed, we believe the miracle; but the certainty of sense being supposed, we disbelieve the doctrine. See argument thirteenth or last.

Argument fifteenth. We have seen enow of follies physical and metaphysical. We go on to notice a folly theological. For while the human nature of our Lord is doing upon earth the wonders mentioned in several of the foregoing arguments, it is according to Scripture, not on earth at all, but really and truly in heaven, at the right hand of God. "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things. Acts, 3: 21. But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. Acts, 7: 55. But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. 10: 12.

Argument sixteenth. Transubstantiation is opposed to our Lord's own account of the nature and design of the eucharist. According to him, the best explainer of his own institution, it was ordained for the purpose of solemn commemoration. "This do in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." Luke, 22: 19. 1 Cor. 11: 24, 25, 26. From the foregoing, it appears that, in the eucharistical rite, we are to commemorate our Lord, or remember him. But how commemorate him, if he be then there? if he be then present whole and entire? We commemorate an absent person, but not a present one; therefore if Jesus Christ whole and entire, body, soul, and divinity, be present in the eucharist, commemoration has no room. Commemorate our Lord! How can we? We are with him; we handle him; yea, we eat and drink him! It is idle to talk of remembering our Lord, if he be wholly and entirely present, present corporally, present

mentally, and present divinely, or present in body, soul, and divinity.

Argument seventeenth. I propound a query to the holders of transubstantiation. Are any of them ready and willing to go before the Royal Society in London, and there and then to eat and drink poisoned bread and wine, after having changed the bread and wine, according to their pretension, into flesh and blood? The bread and wine shall be carefully chosen by the Royal Society, and be by them carefully, really, truly poisoned, mingled with poison, mixed with arsenic, Prussic acid, or some other real and effective poison, at the discretion of the chymical members. The poison might be sufficient to injure, to harm life; but not enough to kill, to take life away. The poisoning operation being performed, let the transubstantiating marvel follow. Let any papal priest, the pope's nuncio, or the pope himself, go through the regular incantation and manipulation, and perform the whole affair of miracle-making, of turning a bit of bread and a drop of wine into the body of a man, into human flesh and blood! It would be worth the pope's while to visit London for the purpose, in order to convince the British protestant. Now surely if transubstantiation would change the bread and wine, it would change the poison; if it would leave behind no bready or farinaceous, and no winy or vinous, it would leave behind no poisonous or venene particle of matter. A real believer in the doctrine would believe that the poison had shared the fate of the bread and wine, that all three had gone one way, or had acquired a new nature. Are transubstantiationites sincere? This formal exhibition would try and prove their sincerity.

Argument eighteenth. Even according to papal folk themselves, transubstantiation is conditional and uncertain, being built on the slippery word *if*, or on at least four conditions, any one, two, or three whereof, or even

all four whereof may fail. We are told that there is consecration, and therefore transubstantiation, if there be four requisites, or if all be right in four things,—if there be no defect in the *priestly character*, no defect in the *intention*, no defect in the *matter*, no defect in the *form*. But if there be a defect in any one of the four,—in the priestly character, or in the intention, or in the matter, or in the form, there is no consecration, and therefore no transubstantiation. A defect in priestly character, intention, matter, or form, will confessedly and avowedly render the consecration and transubstantiation null and void. Now no man or woman alive can tell that all the defects are avoided, or are absent; therefore no one, laic or cleric, can tell or know that there are real consecration and real transubstantiation.

1st. Perhap the officiating priest is not a real priest, has not the real priestly character. According to the doctrine of Priestal Intention,* nobody on earth can be certain that a supposed priest is a real one; that he was really ordained, really confirmed, or really baptized, as we shall find when we come to that doctrine. He might be ordained, confirmed, baptized by one who, through want of the right intention in a prior priest, was not a real priest, or who had not the right intention; and therefore he might not be rightly and really ordained, confirmed, baptized. He might be ordained, confirmed, baptized by a wrong man, or in a wrong manner, the man or the manner, or both, being defective; and therefore his ordination, confirmation, baptism, might be defective and null. Moreover, he might not be rightly and really ordained on some other ground beside the want of right intention in another.

* The very priestrulative and jesuitical doctrine of Priestal Intention here referred to, will be fully developed in a following section, the seventeenth. And the reader will find the reasoning here drawn therefrom to be not at all overwrought.

His ordination might be defective and null through an outward and visible defect or flaw therein, through a failure perceptible externally, and knowable by other men; or through the similarly defective and null ordination of his ordainer. He might be ordained in a wrong manner, or by a wrong man. 2nd. Perhaps the priest, even if a real one, has not the right intention, does not intend to consecrate. 3rd. Perhaps there is not the right or due matter. 4th. Perhaps there is not the right or due form. Reader, here are four grounds for doubting. And from the doubt, or more than doubt, as to priestly character, intention, matter, or form, as to one or more, or all four, transubstantiation is doubtful even to the mind of the transubstantiator.

Subsection III. Article 1. The only argument brought by the kirk of Rome to prove the horrible conceit of transubstantiation, is the presumed literal meaning of some few passages in the New Testament, where our Lord speaks of bread being his body, and of wine being his blood; and of eating his flesh, and of drinking his blood. Transubstantiation stands on the pretended literal meaning of perhaps half a dozen passages, and has no other leg to stand upon.

Article 2. Reply first. The following examples, however, taken from a very large number, clearly prove that the literal meaning is not everywhere the real and true meaning of the inspired penmen, amply show that the verbal signification is not universally upheld by the analogy of Scripture. The following specimens, few selected from many, enable one to see that scriptural analogy is not wholly opposed to the figurative meaning, many passages being taken figuratively, typically, or metaphorically even by transubstantiators themselves.

"This cup is the new testament in my blood." Luke, 22:20. 1 Cor. 11:25. How is a *cup* a *testament*? In John, 10, Christ calls himself the *door*; not some pieces

of wood nailed together. He calls himself the *good shepherd*; not a man following a flock of sheep, with a crook in his hand, and a dog at his heel. In John, 14, Christ calls himself the *way*; not a road for walking on formed of stone and gravel. He calls himself the *truth*; not an assemblage of propositions. In John, 15, our Lord calls himself the *vine*, and his father the *husbandman*; not a tree that bears grapes, and a man that keeps a vineyard, a vine-dresser or an agricultor. In Rev. 22:16, our Lord calls himself the *morning star*. In Matt. 16:18, Christ calls the apostle *a stone or piece of rock*. "Thou art Peter," that is, a stone or piece of rock. But will any papite take the words literally?—See Rev. 1:20, where the seven stars are called the *angels*, and the seven candlesticks the *seven churches*. See Matt. 13, where the figurative style is employed over and over. In Psalm 18, God is called a *rock*, *fortress*, *buckler*, *horn of salvation*, *high tower*; not a huge lump of stone, not a kind of Pendennis castle, not a defensive weapon buckled to the left arm, not a hard substance that grew on the head of a quadruped, not a high building of stone, brick, and mortar. In Psalm 84, the Lord God is called a *sun* and *shield*; not an astronomical luminary, the centre of a system of heavenly bodies; not a mere composition of metal and bull-hides, to be held upon the arm in war. "Thy word is a *lamp* to my feet, and a *light* to my path." Ps. 119:105.

Reply second. I go on to show that even transubstantiators do not keep to the literal meaning. The papite, as well as the protestant, is unable to take the eucharistal words literally, and is compelled to explain them in a figurative way. I quote the following, nearly and substantially, from the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, article Supper of the Lord. "There is not, in the whole New Testament, a single word or a single phrase that, if interpreted literally, gives the slightest countenance to the

wonderful doctrine of transubstantiation. The reader will remember that transubstantiation consists in a change of the *matter, imperceptible substance, substratum* of the bread and wine, into the *matter, imperceptible substance, substratum* of our Lord's flesh and blood; for even Romanites allow that the *form, appearance, sensible qualities, properties* of the bread and wine, remain, being, after consecration, either supported by the matter of Christ's flesh and blood, or hung upon nothing. But the phrase, *This is my body*, if taken in the literal sense, cannot possibly denote the consequence of such a change as this; for every person at all acquainted with the Greek language, especially the language of the Peripatetic school, knows that *το σαρκα μου*, *my body*, signify not the matter or substratum of my body divested of its sensible qualities, but the body of me in its natural state, consisting of matter and qualities, or matter and form united. Therefore, unless the sensible qualities as well as the matter of the bread and wine, give place to the sensible qualities as well as the matter of our Saviour's body and blood, and unless he appear glorified on the altar, as he appeared on the mount at his transfiguration, the words *my body*, must be taken figuratively. Had the apostles understood their Master's words in the sense in which they are understood by the church of Rome, they would have rendered them, not—*This is my body*, but—*This is the matter of my body*. In like manner, when John relates that Jesus said, 'Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day,' had he understood his adorable Master to speak of his flesh and blood in the eucharist, in the sense in which they are taught to be there by the church of Rome, he would have represented him as saying, 'Whoso eateth *the matter of* my flesh, and drinketh *the matter of* my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.' John, 6: 54."

SECTION VIII.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

Subsection I. The sacrifice of the Mass, or Christ offered sacrificially for sin, appears now to claim our grave and careful attention. Papal folk pretend that, in the performing of the mass, the bread and wine are transubstantiated or turned into the flesh and blood, the real body of our Lord ; and are then offered up to God as a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the sin of quick and dead ! for people on earth, and souls in purgatory ! They pretend that the bread and wine are made into Christ's body ; and that his body, when made, is offered sacrificially for the sin of the world ! The bread and wine being transubstantiated into a Jesus Christ or Host ! are offered as an atonement or expiatory sacrifice for sin ! Both operations are implied in the mass. What a monster twofold scheme ! N. B. The Host rightly means the consecrated bread or wafer and wine. Sometime it means, perhap less correctly, the consecrated bread or wafer alone.

According to popery, the soul of our Lord, in the sacrifice of the mass, is present, being joined to the body, there being both body and soul. Firstly. See section sixth or last, where I have given two reasons why the soul of our Lord, in the eucharist, is present to the body. The first reason holds good in the sacrifice of the mass, if not the second. Secondly. Here I will give two other reasons, both applicable to the mass sacrifice. 1st. The mere body, mere inanimate matter, cannot either die or suffer, being incapable either of death or of suffering, two things required in a real and proper sacrifice. 2nd. It could not be whole Christ offered up, if a part of him, and the main or better part, were wanting. What kind of

Christ would that be, having a part only, and the inferior part, or the body; the superior and nobler part, or the soul, being absent?

According to popery, the Divinity of our Lord, in the sacrifice of the mass, is present, being joined to the body and soul, there being body, soul, and divinity.

Having disproved transubstantiation, we go on to disprove the sacrifice of the mass. Having, in section last, considered and confuted the papal vagary in relation to the former doing, we proceed now to consider and confute their unfounded whim relating to the latter operation. Having shown the first part to be unsound and untenable, we undertake to show the second part to be equally void of solidity, equally incredible, equally bad.

In handling the latter point, the sacrifice of the mass, and in disproving the consummately irrational and unbiblical scheme, we will treat the thing in two ways, indirectly or mediately, and directly or immediately.

Subsection II. Indirectly or mediately. Having shown transubstantiation to be erroneous, I have mediately and consequentially proved the sacrifice of the mass to be an error. Transubstantiation is implied and presupposed by the sacrifice of the mass. If transubstantiation were real, the sacrifice of the mass might be real or might be unreal; but the former being unreal, the latter must be unreal too. Transubstantiation could be without the other, but the other cannot be without transubstantiation. In fine, transubstantiation being wrong, the sacrifice of the mass depending thereon cannot be right, but must be wrong too.

Subsection III. Article 1. Directly or immediately. The papal doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, is both unreasonable and unscriptural.

Article 2. Unreasonable. I will give two reasons in opposition to the doctrine, showing the sacrifice to be both *inutile* and *incomplete*.

Reason first. Inutile. One sacrifice, that completed on the cross, having removed the obstacle from between man and God, there is no need of more. One sacrifice having opened up the way to the mercy of God, while he is just; to save the sinner, without sparing sin; to exert his darling attribute of love, without weakening the claim and authority of holiness, in the view of the rational creation; another sacrifice is a mere superfluity, an idle display, a thing in vain. A second sacrifice is going about to do either what is already done, or what is not required to be done. Now how can the sacrifice of the mass be utile? Not at all.

Papites affirm that the sacrifice of the cross, and that of the mass, are not two and different, but one and same. We however affirm, and shall prove that they are not one and same, but two and different, differing radically one from the other. I will give five reasons. 1st. A different sacrifice or victim, another Christ. (See transubstantiation, subsection II. argument third.) 2nd. A different sacrificer, the sacrificer in the mass being not the Lord, but a mere man, a priest. 3rd. A different time. 4th. A different place, unless the mass be performed on Calvary. 5th. A different manner, the mass sacrifice being undying, unsuffering, unbloody, and the like.

Even if the sacrifice of the cross and that of the mass were one and same, it need not be offered more than once. Why offer up one sacrifice in two or many times, in two or many places, and in two modes?

I remark, in passing, that the sacrifice of the mass is not one and same, but many and different, every mass sacrifice being different from every other. I am not required, however, to prove the point formally here, having merely to refer the reader to the last paragraph but one, where he will find the plan of proving laid down pretty fully, whereby he may prove for himself.

Reason second. Incomplete. A real and proper sacri-

fice implies the suffering and death of the victim ; and a real and proper sacrifice for men, implies the suffering and death of a real and proper man, of one who is of the seed of woman. But a eucharistal or bread-and-wine Christ, not being born of a woman, is not a real and proper man, or not fully human, having a nonhuman body and a nonhuman soul. Moreover, he does not die, being eaten and drunk alive. Moreover, he does not suffer, being impassible. (See Transubstantiation, subsection II. argument tenth.) Moreover, he cannot suffer, living here not long enough, being on earth not perhap half an hour. And neither suffering nor doing, he is neither passive nor active. Now, from the foregoing four things, namely, that a eucharistal Christ is not a real and proper man, that he dies not, that he suffers not, and that he does not, how can the sacrifice of the mass be complete ? Not at all.

Article 3. Unscriptural. Firstly. The silence of Scripture. I have here to remark two things. Thing first. The ministers or preachers under the Gospel of christian dispensation are nowhere in Scripture called *sacrificers* or *sacrificing priests*. They are called by many a name—overseer, elder, minister, preacher, shepherd, steward, and the like ; but are never called by the name *sacrificer*. Now if real and proper sacrifices be offered under the Gospel, it is utterly unaccountable, and quite a marvel, that the men who offer them, are nowhere, not even in a single passage, called sacrificers. Surely if the christian ministry offered sacrifices, they would have at least one name once given them, indicating so important a part of their employ. If the papal pretended sacrifice were real and true, the christian minister would, in one passage at least, be named a sacrificer, or the like. See the Introduction, article III.

Thing second. Scripture nowhere makes mention of the sacrifice of the mass, nowhere even alludes thereto. The word sacrifice, taken in a meaning vague and figura-

tive, is employed in the New Testament, in Rom. 12 : 1 ; Phil. 4 : 18 ; Heb. 13 : 15, 16 ; and perhap a passage or two more. But taken in the strict, proper, literal meaning, the word sacrifice is nowhere used in relation to the christian scheme or the gospel kingdom, excepting the one great sacrifice of Christ completed on the cross. Any other real and proper sacrifice belonging to christianity is nowhere alluded to in the word of God. No real mention or allusion is found, in the New Testament or the Old, to the sacrifice of the mass. The account of ministerial duties under the Gospel economy contains nothing at all about sacrificing. Now if the mass sacrifice were real and proper, if the papal pretension were true, the Bible undoubtedly would not be silent on the point, a point of so great weight.*

Secondly. The language of Scripture. "This he did once, when he offered up himself. Heb. 7:27. By his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true ; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us. *Nor yet that he should offer himself often*, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others ; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world : but now *once* in the end of the world, hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment ; so Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many ; and unto them that look for him, shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation. Heb. 9 : 12, 24-28. By the

* See Fletcher's Lectures on the Principles and Institutions of the Roman Catholic Religion ; a very able work, one written in the spirit of piety, and one that, though very far from wanting a recommendation from me, I do cordially recommend.

which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all*. But this man, after he had offered *one sacrifice* for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God. By *one offering*, he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Where remission of sin is, there is no more offering for sin. There remaineth *no more* sacrifice for sins. Heb. 10 : 10, 12, 14, 18, 26. Christ hath *once* suffered for sin, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." 1 Pet. 3 : 18.

In affirming a propitiatory sacrifice and remission, but denying the shedding of blood ; in maintaining the mass sacrifice to be a real and proper one, but calling it unbloody, papal folk contradict the apostle Paul. "Without shedding of blood is no remission." Heb. 9 : 22. Without shedding the blood of the victim or sacrifice through whom the sin is remitted, is no remission. Any other victim is not to the point.

Subsection IV. From the foregoing consideration of the character of the papal doctrine now under review, what opinion do you, reasonable and scriptural reader, entertain of the doctrine ? Do you not deem it insulting to right reason, and decidedly opposed to the word of God ? Rightly does the kirk of England, in her 31st Article, term it a "blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit."

Subsection V. The Sacrifice of the Mass, and the implied or presupposed doctrine of Transubstantiation, are maintained to magnify the pope and priesthood. How it must augment their pride, power, wealth, and the like, to work the eucharistal miracle, to be miracle-mongers and *Christ-creators*, to have, in every consecrated bread and wine, Jesus Christ, body, soul, and divinity ! Some of the haughty hierarchs have declared, "*Priests do create their Creator !*"* Moreover, how it

* A French Roman catholic writer says,—"This honour have the priests, that they create their Creator !" See Edgar's Variations of Popery second edition, on the pope's supremacy.—W. C. B.

must pamper their pride, power, plenty, and the like to be, like the Jewish priesthood, sacrificing priests, and to be, in the view of the laity, able to offer up a sacrifice or atonement for the living and the dead, for people on earth, and souls in purgatory! They protect their usurped dominion over the soul, body, and estate of the people, and save themselves from all popular control, by appearing to the people in the light of protectors and saviours! protecting them from punishment, and saving them from sin, and having the power, by offering or sacrificing a Christ, to obtain the favor of God, and open the gate of heaven!

SECTION IX.

THE WORSHIP OF THE HOST.

Subsection I. The host (or consecrated bread and wine) is really made the object of worship or adoration, papites falling down prostrate before it, as before the Divine Being! To bread and wine, or to either of them separately, they give what they call *Latria*, or the highest or divine worship, that exclusively due to God! endeavoring to justify their idolatrous conduct, by vainly pretending that the host is not bread and wine, but whole and entire Christ, body, soul, and divinity!

Subsection II. Indirectly or mediately. Having shown transubstantiation to be erroneous, I have mediately and consequentially proved the worship of the host to be an error.* Transubstantiation being wrong,

* If Transubstantiation be an error, then is it a falsehood to say that the wafer is "really and truly Christ's body and blood; soul

the worship of the host, depending thereon, cannot be right, but must be wrong too. See section seventh or last.

A defect in *priestly character, intention, matter, or form*, will confessedly and avowedly render the consecration and transubstantiation null and void, or hinder them from being real and true; and consequently will, even according to papal view, make host-worship to be foul idolatry, the worship of mere bread and wine! of mere inanimate matter! of a breaden or a wine-made god!

See the other seventeen arguments given in opposition to the transubstantiation monster, arguments that I am not required to bring forward here, but whereto I desire to refer the reader. If the arguments be real or good, transubstantiation is unreal or bad; and therefore host-worship is no better than real and rank idolatry, than adoring as the Lord of all, a bit of bread and a drop of wine!

Subsection III. Directly or immediately. We find nothing at all like host worship or the worship of the elements, at the Supper directly afore the Crucifixion, by Christ or the apostles. None there gave divine worship to the consecrated bread and wine. The worship of the host is quite unscriptural, having in the Bible neither command nor example.

Papites, in worshipping the host, do not and cannot know that they worship the Lord. It appears that pope Adrian VI. judged that when people worship the host, they ought to say in their own mind, "*I worship thee, if thou be Christ.*"* What a comment on host-

and divinity. And if so, then the worship paid to it is not merely an *error*, it is *IDOLATRY* of the worst kind. It is homage paid to a piece of inanimate matter.—W. C. B.

* Even the best informed Roman Catholic can go no farther than to say this. No one can know whether the holy priest had the *intention*, really and truly to make the wafer a real Christ, soul and

worship! "*I worship thee, if thou be Christ.*" Papites, "Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship." John, 4:22.

SECTION X.

HALF COMMUNION, OR NO CUP TO THE LAITY.

Subsection I. This papal doctrine or practice requires but few words. It is a papal innovation tending unfairly to pull down the laity below the level of the clergy; to squeeze the former to the ground, and to exalt the latter over them; to make the many laïcles nothing, and the few clericals everything. It would be hard to find a more glaring, palpable, arrogant, impudent plan on the part of the Roman clergy, to lower and degrade the laity, than the refusal of the Cup in the Eucharist.

Subsection II. The tendency and aptitude of the denial of the cup to the laity, to degrade and dishonor them, and to elevate and dignify the clergy, are the grand recommendation of the denial to clerical favor, are the leading reason, the main cause why the cup has been denied. Holy Scripture and good reason are utterly opposed to withholding the cup; not a single passage

divinity. But if he had NOT the INTENTION to do so, it is, in fact, not Christ. Hence to worship the host, not made a Christ by the INTENTION, is to worship a piece of matter, instead of God! But no one who takes the mass can be certain that it is really consecrated, and made truly Christ. Hence, not one soul who takes the mass has any security, even in the least degree, that he is not guilty of the mortal sin of idolatry. Hence no mass-partakers can ever have the comfort of the true christian. They can never say, "I believe, and I am sure!"—W. C. B.

of the New Testament really favoring the invidious and insolent distinction, and five directly opposing it, and good reason crying shame! shame! shame! to the clergy!* In denying the cup to the laity, the kirk of Rome opposes not only Scripture and reason, but also the primitive kirk, the pure and primitive kirk confessedly having allowed both bread and wine to clergy and laity. Both kinds were allowed till the eleventh century. The clergy have no better reason for denying the wine, than for denying the bread, wine and bread being equally mentioned in Scripture, by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul in 1 Cor. 10 and 11. Moreover, the clergy have no better reason for denying to the laity, than for denying to their own selves, laity and clergy being equally entitled and authorised. Moreover, the clergy have no better reason for denying to the laity, than the laity have for denying to the clergy, clerical denial to the laity being not less bad and wrongful than laical denial to the clergy. It follows that the priesthood, having no good ground, no good reason for their denial, deny the cup to the people, to lessen and degrade them, to pamper their own pride, to indulge their own presumption, and to confirm their own power. They deprive the people of the cup at the table of the Lord, in order to deprive them of liberty every where else! they insult them as christians, that they may injure them as men! See section second, subsection II. argument 8, about the councils of Constance and Trent.

* And one of the Roman popes condemned the impious encroachment. It was pope Gelasius, who, in the year 492, pronounced, ex cathedra, from his chair, that the abstraction of the cup, as some then proposed it, was an *impious sacrilege!*—See *Corp. Juris Canon. Par. 2, Dist. 3.*

SECTION XI.

IDOLATRY.

Subsection 1. The papal kirk appears liable to the charge of idolatry, in the following two ways: 1st. Worshipping or adoring glorified saints and angels. 2nd. Worshipping God by an idol or image, by a cross and crucifix, or the like. It has not fallen so low as the natives of Greece, Rome, India, China, and the like; it has not been guilty of an idolatry so foul and degrading as that whereby they are unfavorably known. But in a more limited, modified, or refined meaning of the term idolatry, the followers of that kirk are idolaters. They are not idolaters of the lower order, but are idolaters of the foregoing twofold species or kind. Papal idolaters, do hear and heed the following command given through Paul: "*Flee from Idolatry.*" 1 Cor. 10 : 14.

The worship of the Host may be called idolatry, being the worship of bread and wine, of a breaden and a wine-made god! But the worship is given on the hollow and weak presumption that the host is no longer bread and wine, but whole and entire Christ, body, soul, and divinity! Papites pretend that they find in the wafer and cup, or in either of them, our redeeming Lord, manhood and Godhead! and that they adore him shining through the covering or envelope of superficial, formal, apparent bread and wine. Pretension puerile and profane! See Section VIII.*

* They worship the Host, because "Christ is there in it, present in it and with it;" and "shines out through it!" If this be correct, then I ought to bow down, and worship any object where God is present and shines out from it. Now, a great mountain, a beautiful tree, a lovely human being may, on this same principle, be worshipped. God is there: God shines there!—W. C. B.

Subsection I. Article I. Worship, adoration, invocation of a glorified saint and angel, may be of a twofold kind. 1st. Direct and immediate. 2nd. Indirect and mediate, by the medium of an idol or image, or of a relic, even relics being largely employed in the unholy work. The second is the worse, grosser, more debasing kind of the two; and will sink its votary more deeply in moral and mental degradation, spreading a darker hue, a more dismal ruin over the originally noble nature of the soul. Both kinds are carried on by the kirk of Rome, the second kind more fully, may be, than the first.

Under the dark and dreary cloud of popery, a very woful amount of worship is given to the creature. Tillotson, in sermon 11, declared that for one *Paternoster* there are commonly said ten *Ave Marias*! for one prayer made to Almighty God, ten are made to the Virgin Mary! And Joseph Fletcher, in Lecture 6, remarks that, by consulting papal books of devotion, one might imagine *four* persons to be in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, *and the Virgin!*

Article 2. A glorified saint and angel may be invoked under three characters. 1st. As an inferior god or secondary deity. 2d. As a mediator between man and God. 3rd. As a mediator between man and Jesus Christ. I will briefly review the three theories in the foregoing order.

Article 3. As an inferior god or secondary deity, invocation of a glorified saint and angel, indirectly and mediately, or directly and immediately, being worship or adoration, is both unscriptural and unreasonable.

Firstly. Unscriptural. "I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no God but me." See the first commandment. Exodus, 20. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Matt. 4:10. Luke, 4:8. The apostles Paul and Barnabas would not be worshipped. Acts, 14:14. The apostle John was

not allowed to worship the angel or maybe glorified saint. "See thou do it not—worship God." Rev. 19: 10, and 22: 9. The apostle Peter would not be worshipped. Acts, 10: 26. "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things that he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind; and not holding the Head." Col. 2: 18, 19.

Secondly. Unreasonable. Reason 1st. A glorified saint and angel, though incomparably superior to a saint on earth, are not *omniscient*; therefore they may not know when we pray to them. 1st. They are not omnipresent; therefore they may not be near, they may be far, very far when we pray. And if one million people in one million places, pray in one moment, to one creature, the creature prayed to must be absent from all but one, and may be absent from all. When the Virgin Mary, Paul, Peter, John, Michael, Gabriel, and the like, are prayed to by us, they may be millions, billions, trillions of miles off; may be surrounding the throne of God in heaven, adoring Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; or may be at the farthest or remotest point of the whole creation, at creation's opposite extreme. How then can they hear our prayer? how can they know that we pray to them? Being so far from them, we may as well pray to the wind as to them. As they have not omnipresence or ubiquity, there is probably not one chance in a million that they hear our prayer; and therefore our prayer is absurd, or is labor in vain. Our praying to creatures who cannot hear is an act of unchristian folly. 2d. Probably a glorified saint and angel are not heart-searching, soul-seeing, mind-conning; therefore even if near us when we pray, they may not know our thought and prayer. Our prayer may be a mental one, and we are not certain that they know and understand our secret thought or private

idea. Who can prove that a saint and angel read our heart, penetrate the interior of our mind, dive to the bottom of our soul, see and know our privy notion, notion hidden from outward view, and fully comprehend all our inner and retired feeling? No man. Consequently we must pray to them audibly, with vocal sound, in oral language, or we may not be heard by them even when they are near, even when close to our elbow. In praying to a saint and angel, we must not depend on mental prayer. "I the Lord search the heart: Jer. 17: 10. God only, knoweth the hearts of the children of men." 2 Chron. 6: 30.

Reason 2d. A glorified saint and angel are not *omnipotent*; therefore they may not be able to grant what we pray for, even if they know that we pray. Indeed they have no power at all, none whatever, independently of Jehovah; hence their power will be as inadequate as their knowledge, and peradventure much more. They must therefore go to God, and beg him to answer our prayer. Then why not go to God ourselves? If we must apply to the Lord in the end, indirectly, mediately through a saint or angel, why not apply to him in the beginning, directly, immediately?

Article 4. As a mediator between man and God, invocation of a glorified saint and angel, being a kind of worship or adoration, is both unscriptural and unreasonable, and therefore displeasing to God.

Firstly. Unscriptural. "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me. John, 14: 6. There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. 2: 5. John was not allowed to worship the angel. Peter would not be worshipped. See Col. 2: 18. See paragraph in Article 3.

Secondly. Unreasonable. Reason 1st. A glorified saint and angel are not omniscient. See Article 3, Reason 1st.

Reason 2d. In relation to beings in glory, the supposed mediation is all on one side, they interceding for us, but we not for them. Now this inequality will perhap promote a feeling of inferiority and dependence on our part, and lead us to pay them too great honor, honor amounting to very fearful idolatry, and to take them for beings somewhat divine.

Reason 3d. One mediator being enough, why have more ? 1st. One is enough. Whence came the need of a mediator ? A mediator was required to remove the obstacle to our salvation, arising from Divine justice, to maintain the honor of God's universal government, or to uphold the integrity and inviolability of the awful sanction supporting the Divine law. By mean of the mediator, God has magnified the law, and made it honorable ; Isa. 42 : 21. God can be just, and the justifier of them who believe in Jesus. Rom. 3 : 26

The sinner's friend, but sin's eternal foe.

UNKNOWN.

Die man, or justice must ; unless for him,
Some other able and as willing pay
The rigid satisfaction, death for death.

MILTON.

Our Lord partaking of both divinity and humanity, is properly the mediator between God and man, the one mediator ; and he has done all that the mediator was required to do. 2d. Now why have more ? To have two, or two dozen, or two hundred, or two thousand mediators when one is enough, is in complete opposition to the unity and simplicity observable in the doing of the Deity, of the great Lord of all, being opposite to analogy. If one will do, wherefore have two ? One God, and one Mediator.

Reason 4th. The multitude of mediators intercept our view of God. They stand in the way between us and the Deity ; and instead of making our coming to him

more easy, make it more difficult, by distracting our thought, and dividing our attention among themselves. We have to regard not one, but maybe one hundred; and are compelled to look to a crowd of feeble mediators, instead of looking to Almighty God.

Reason 5th. The theory of many mediators involves a slander or blasphemy on God. It impeaches his goodwill and love, by representing him as stern, cruel, unrelenting, unforgiving; by exhibiting him as originally unwilling to do us good, and as agreeing to do it then only when importuned by a multitude of mediators, and tired out by a very great amount of intercession.

Reason 6th. The theory involves a kind of slander or blasphemy on the Redeemer, our Lord Jesus Christ. It represents him as an incomplete, an imperfect mediator; as if his mediation were inadequate, as if his intercession were not enough.

Reason 7th. Saints and angels compared with Jesus Christ, are unimportant, insignificant, and empty. To join a few of them with him, in order to help him in his mediatorial work, is like holding up a few candles in order to help the sun to enlighten the solar system. Now is it probable that beings so unequal in dignity and grandity, have been joined together as partners and coadjutors in one and same office and work? Verily not.

Article 5. Objection. A papite may object, that more mediators than Jesus Christ mediate more with God; that the more interceders, the more interceding. I will give two replies. 1st. However that may be, we may not oppose Holy Writ and the preponderating evidence of reason, both whereof are hostile to the plan of invoking any glorified saint or angel to mediate between man and God. 2d. God regards not the quantity, but the quality; not the number, but the value. Great and small, many and few, are alike to the Infinite Jehovah. If the thing requested be proper to be given, our Re-

deemer's only intercession is enough, and as good as more; if the thing be improper, the intercession of thousands of saints and angels will be too little, and of no avail. No cruelty, no ill-will can be found in God. "God is love. God is love." 1 John, 4:8, 16. Moreover, no weak side, no favoritism, no partiality can be found with Jehovah. "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." Rev. 15.

In the corrupted currents of this world,
Offence's gilded hand may shove by Justice;
And oft 'tis seen, the wicked prize itself
Buys out the law. But 'tis not so above.

SHAKESPEARE.

Article 6. As a mediator between man and Jesus Christ, invocation of a glorified saint and angel is both unscriptural and unreasonable.

Firstly. Unscriptural. We read nothing in Holy Scripture about the sub-mediation or the under-mediators, and we do not find the scheme recognized and allowed by the holy-inspired people therein mentioned. The plan of secondary mediators and mediation is not of Divine appointment, and did not originate with the Divine founder of Christianity. John was not allowed to worship the angel. Peter would not be worshipped. See Col. 2:18.

Secondly. Unreasonable. Reason 1st. A glorified saint and angel are not omniscient. See Article 4, Reason 1st.

Reason 2d. "In relation to beings in glory, the supposed mediation is all on one side." See Article 4, Reason 2d.

Reason 3d. The under-mediators are not required, have nothing properly to do, no peculiar duty to perform; but are an unprofitable or inutile set of beings, sitting down and looking at each other through want of other occupation. We can do better without their

mediation than with it, and may go to Jesus Christ directly and immediately ; for between him and us we find no obstacle requiring to be removed by mean of a mediator. Now to have inferior mediators when none is really required, is in complete opposition to the unity and simplicity observable in the doing of the Deity, of the great Lord of all, being opposite to analogy. Why have an officer when you have no office to be filled ?

Reason 4th. The under-mediators intercept our view of Jesus Christ, standing in the way between us and the Saviour. We have to regard not one, but maybe one hundred ; and are compelled to look to a crowd of saints and angels, instead of (as Paul commands) " looking unto Jesus." Heb. 12 : 2.

Reason 5th. The theory of under-mediators involves a slander of blasphemy on Jesus Christ. It impeaches his good-will and love, by representing him as a lukewarm and unfeeling kind of mediator ; by exhibiting him as unkind and unwilling to benefit if not urged on by a set of under-mediators. Certainly this character of our blessed Lord is a false and abominable calumny, a monstrous defamation, a libel black as hell. Verily, verily the Redeemer of mankind needs not the persuasion and intercession that the theory implies ; for he loves the world with a love stronger than life, more attractive than heaven, and durable like eternity.

Reason 6th. The plan destroys the unity, the beautiful simplicity, the ready practicability, the easy *rememberability* of the Bible system ; and brings in their room plurality, complexity, difficulty, and confusion. Christianity commands, " Go to God ; and go to Jesus Christ, as the way to God." Popery commands, " Go to God ; and go to Jesus Christ, as the way to God ; and go to the Virgin, to Peter, to Paul, to John, to Michael, to Gabriel, and to many more, as the way to Jesus Christ " Alas ! what a falling off is here ! Many poor, ignorant,

weak-minded people might be unable to remember the whole, might be puzzled to think of all the mediatorial names, might find it hard to recollect the threefold gradation, might forget to go step by step along the regular progression, might often not know to whom to pray, and therefore might often not pray at all. But the poor, ignorant, weak-minded people can well carry in their memory, can easily recal to their mind, the two ideas,—God and Jesus Christ—one God and one Mediator.

Reason 7th. The next effort in the way of improving christianity, will perhap be the appointment of a set of tertiary mediators to mediate or intercede for one with the secundaries. We may hear of going to some real or pretended saint of the Roman calendar, to Cecilia, Ursula, Francis, and Dominic, to this, that, and t'other, as the way to the Virgin, Peter, Paul, and John. What then? where go to find the fourth or quartern set of mediators, they who will carry one to the tertiaries? I opine that the quartaries are the pope and the priesthood for the time being. In fine, the mediatorial scheme when perfected according to papal ideas of perfection, will possibly contain the four degrees: Primary—Secundaries—Tertiaries—Quartaries. Bible christian, you have not so learned Christ. Eph. 4: 20.

Article. 7. Objection. A papite may object that the theory of invoking saintly and angelical mediators between man and God, or between man and Jesus Christ, or both, is analagous to the moral order of the present world, where men and women often act, by reciprocal entreaty, as mediators one for another. I will give six replies.

1st. However men and women act here below, we may not oppose God's own word, his revealed will, and the preponderating weight of reason, both whereof are hostile to the plan of invoking any glorified saint or angel to mediate either between man and God, or between man and Jesus Christ.

2d. Omnipresence or ubiquity, requisite for mediators in heaven, is not required for mediators on earth; for the latter are among and around us, meet us yearly, daily, and hourly, and go along with us in the walk of life. The disadvantage is confined to mediation in heaven.

3d. The imagined saintly and angelical mediation is all on one side, glorified saints and angels interceding for us, but we not for them. Now this inequality has very woful tendency and result, leading to very fearful idolatry, and bringing on effect of a melancholy kind. Papites do not only ask or entreat a glorified saint or angel to intercede for them, but *pray* to him to do so, praying on their knees with a kind of religious or irreligious homage, with a sort of worship or adoration. (See Article 4, reason 2d.) But human mediation on earth is mutual, A interceding for B, and B for A. And this reciprocation, or interchange of benefit, keeps all parties in mediatorial equality, and prevents the bad effect mentioned before. The disadvantage is confined to mediation in heaven.

4th. Human mediation on earth by reciprocal request may promote reciprocal love and mutual good acting among the imperfect inhabitants of our globe, hereby leading to great good and producing a happy result. But glorified saints and angels being perfect, require no plan of mediation, require not to be invoked in order to love us and to do us all the good they can. And what can be said about our love and good acting toward beings in heaven? The advantage is confined to mediation on earth.

5th. Power to act as mediators, to intercede effectively for other people, may promote piety here below, may lead people to fear and love God; and therefore the power is divinely allowed here on earth; and therefore human mediation may allowably and even bene-

ficially be asked for upon earth, where holiness and sin contend for mastery, where virtue and vice wage war for dominion. But beings in heaven having piety in perfection, are in need of no like stimulant, require no similar incitement in relation to virtue and moral purity; and therefore they probably are not, like people here below, employed in mediation; and therefore they ought not to be invoked to mediate. The advantage is confined to mediation on earth.

6th. We have Biblical example, authority, and command for entreating men and women on earth to pray to God on our behalf; therefore the entreaty is agreeable to God, harmonizing with the declaration of his word, and hereby concurring with his will.

Subsection III. Article I. Worship of God by an idol or image, by a cross and crucifix, or the like, can easily be shown to be strongly condemned in Holy Writ. I might quote passage after passage, and verse after verse to set forth the unscripturality of its character; but I rather like the readers to read the Bible for themselves, and to see with their own eyes how the worship is viewed by the wisdom of God. I will give five quotations. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them," &c. &c. &c. See the second commandment. Exod. 20. N. B. Papal folk commonly either leave the second commandment altogether out of their prayer-books, catechisms, and the like, or put it in them partially and imperfectly; therefore they tacitly condemn their own conduct, and virtually declare that their papal doings are in opposition to the second command of the decalogue. "Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you

in Horeb out of the midst of the fire: lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female, &c. &c. Deut. 4: 15, 16. Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman, and putteth it in a secret place. Deut. 27: 15. Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device. Acts, 17: 29. Little children, keep yourselves from idols." 1 John, 5: 21.

Article 2. This manner of worshipping the Deity, namely, by an idol or image, clearly appears to be opposite to reason, right reason; and hereon I hope to convince the reader by the following threefold argument:

1st. It tends to narrow our devotional duty, to limit our approach to our heavenly Father, to confine our prayer in place and time; for we shall pray only there and then where and when we shall have the idol or image. But we may pray to God, *The Good Being*, in all place and in all time, everywhere and everywhen.

2d. It tends to give one low and degrading thoughts of God, to make one regard him as bound to place and time, to make one view him as material. But we have to consider the Divinity, the Almighty, Jehovah, God, as an immaterial being, filling heaven and earth, past, present, and future, from and to all eternity; existing in all expansion, and in all duration. "God is a spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." John, 4: 24.

3d. It tends to make one take the idol or image for God, deem the idol and the Supreme Being one and same, confound the image, a block of wood or piece of stone, with the Deity, the incomprehensible Infinite, the Lord of life and glory. Maybe no dark idolater, no polytheistic heathen, no worshipper of wood and stone

who once held a creed of pure theism, began his very degrading and revolting progress of idolatry, by viewing his idol or image as God. He began his miserable career by viewing the idol or image as God's representative, as Jehovah's deputy. In the course of time, however, he came to confound the representative with the Being represented, to mingle the deputy with the principal, to make no distinction between an inanimate creature and the Creator, and to worship the corporeal or pictorial representation of God, as God himself. The foul idolater begins by worshipping God through a material medium, and ends by erecting the material medium into a god.

Article 3. A papite and a heathen too are ready with the following plausible and showy argument: We find it somewhat hard to worship God directly or immediately, and find it comparatively easy to worship him by material mediums; therefore we use them to aid our devotion, worshipping less in the immediate way, and more in the mediate. I will give three replies.

1st. It is not very hard, not very difficult to worship God immediately, if people think and employ their reason. The less ignorant or the more knowing and intellectual we are, the more easy and agreeable we find immediate worship. Moreover, it is not easier to worship mediately, than immediately; with material mediums, than without them. It is not so easy. It is not easier, and not so easy, according to reason, as we learn by the foregoing three arguments, and by others that might be given. As the rule, or as to the great majority of mankind, material mediums, as an idol or image, or the like, lead not to devotion, but to idolatry; tending to make man not a rational saint, but a superstitious dishonorer of the one God, and even a miserable polytheist. It is not easier, and not so easy, according to Scripture. If it were easier, it would be re-

commended or even commanded by the page of inspiration ; whereas it is condemned hereby, and therefore is not so easy. God, who perfectly knows whereof we are made, and what we are, would undoubtedly require us to worship him in the mediate way, if that way were the easier and better,—the more effective for our growth in grace and for his own glory. Instead, however, of requiring the mediate kind of adoration, the Lord strongly forbids it, rejecting it throughout the Bible as an evil thing.

2d. However the former part of the argument may be, even supposing it were somewhat hard, somewhat difficult to worship God immediately or without a material medium, we are not to disobey the obvious meaning of the Bible, and to contravene the preponderating dictate of reason, both whereof are hostile to the plan of worshipping God by an idol or image, or the like.

3d. We have a created, a human medium of God's own appointing, the man Jesus Christ, through whom we are invited and commanded to draw near to God. Therefore they who cannot easily raise up their thought to an Infinite Spirit taken essentially, can easily behold him as veiled in the meek and placid glory of the Saviour, in the mild and gentle radiance of the incarnate Word.

In whose conspicuous count'nance, without cloud
Made visible, th' almighty Father shines.

MILTON.

Article 4. I will here mention two great reasons that existed for the incarnation of the second person of the Trinity.

1st. To be our mediator, to atone for our sin, to reconcile us to Jehovah, to bring us back to holiness, and happiness, and heaven. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself. 2 Cor. 5 : 19. Herein is

love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. 1 John, 4 : 10. God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." John, 3 : 16, 17.

2d. To afford man a divinely authorized human medium whereby to approach or appropinquate the Deity. "The glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. 4 : 6. The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth." John, 1 : 14.

SECTION XII.

MERIT.

Subsection I. So far as I understand the papal doctrine of merit, as exhibited in the prosperous and palmy days of popery, or as grown to the full, I take it to imply the following three things :

1st. That we may have merit enough for ourselves ; may have moral merit enough to supply our own want ; may have merit as great as we require for private purpose, for self-security, for home consumption.

2d. That we can perform works of supererogation ; can do more than duty requires ; can be better than we are personally bound to be ; can superabound in merit ; can have more merit than we need for our ownelves ; and, therefore, that we can have merit to spare for other folk ; can have a surplus for the good of our needy neighbor ; can have an overplus for the benefit of people who have too little merit of their own.

3d. That the surplus or overplus, the portion remaining after self-supply, goes to a common stock, to a general fund, to a kind of merit-bank, whence men and women defective in merit, who are not meritorious enough, may draw whatever quantity of merit they require; and that the pope and the priesthood are the bankers, and hand out what amount of merit, to what persons, and on what terms they like, using their own discretion, being, like more than one other body, accountable to none but God.

Subsection II. As by idolatry papal folk dishonor God, so by merit they glorify man. They humble and degrade the Creator; and exalt, pamper the pride of, and deify the creature. Verily, verily the like is not the way to love, serve, and glorify God; nor the way truly to love, faithfully to serve, and really to benefit mankind. To declare the merit doctrine altogether unscriptural and unreasonable, is nearly a superfluity; to proclaim it utterly repugnant to revelation and reason, is well nigh a work of supererogation.

The papal doctrine of merit, even when not carried out to the full extent mentioned here, has naturally an unfavorable and fatal effect on personal piety or real religion, and on final salvation. The deceitful whim of human merit accords little with the humility of the Gospel and the revealed method of salvation, but it falls in exactly with the pride of the corrupt or unrenowned human heart. The deceitful whim will hide from men the deep moral evil of their heart, or the sinful condition of their soul; will hinder them from knowing their full need of the Saviour, their extreme want of pardon through Christ, and of purity by the Spirit; and will lead them to go before the judgment-seat, the great white throne, Rev. 20:11; the holy tribunal of heaven, more or less clad in the filthy rags of their own fancied merit, Isa 64:6; rather than wholly clothed

in the pure and perfect robe of righteousness provided and offered by the Son of God.

Subsection III. It is quite impracticable, quite impossible that we can have more moral merit than we want for ourselves, that we can have any moral merit to spare for another.

1st. Generally or universally. Creatures are bound to practise all virtue, are under obligation to do everything that virtue requires, every thing demanded by the will of God, or by the Antecedent Fitness of Things. They are bound so to practise, are under obligation so to do, on their own account, for their own sake, in relation to their own good. If they practise not all virtue, in all time, and in all place; if they perform not every jot, tittle, and iota morally required of them; they are vicious and immoral, are become morally bad, defective, and wanting in moral merit. Now as they are bound to be perfectly virtuous, as they are required to do everything morally right and proper, with reference even to their own selves, in order to uphold their own good, they cannot thereby, by so being and by so doing, have greater moral merit than they need for themselves; cannot thereby be more meritorious than they are obliged to be; therefore they cannot thereby have any surplus of moral merit to give away to any other creature, cannot have enough and to spare. If they do what they are not bound to do, not bound personally or privately, not bound in relation to their own well-being; if they go out of the way to perform things that duty does not demand, does not demand in regard to their own character and fortune as rational and moral beings; they do and perform what is not virtue, what has no moral merit, and what cannot make morally meritorious even themselves, far less any other creature. Whatever is virtue, they are bound to do on their own account, or to maintain their own morality; there-

fore they cannot thereby have any moral merit to spare for another. Whatever they are not bound to do on their own account, or to maintain their own morality, is not virtue, and cannot partake of moral merit. It is possible for creatures to be as good, virtuous, holy as they ought to be, or to have as great moral merit as they ought to have; but it is impossible for them to be more good, more virtuous, more holy than they ought to be, or to have greater moral merit than they ought to have. All their goodness and virtue they need for themselves; all their moral merit they require for their own, their private, their individual necessitude. How, therefore, is it possible that any mere creature can have any moral merit to bestow on any other creature? Supposing a creature to act with perfect virtue or to live quite free from sin during every moment of its life, from the beginning to the end of its whole duration, it cannot possibly have one particle of moral merit more than it requires for itself, cannot possibly have one particle thereof to hand over to any other being.

2d. Specially or particularly. Men are bound to love God, *The Good Being*, with all their heart, with all their soul, with all their mind, with all their strength; to love their neighbor as themselves; to promote the greatest good of all other creatures; and to prosecute to the full their own happiness, temporal and eternal. Men are obliged and required to do all the triple thing on their own account, for their own sake, with a view to their own good. Now if men do the trinal duty, perform the threefold work completely and perfectly throughout their whole career, in every moment of their life, they do their whole duty, perform all they are bound to perform, and so have perfect virtue, are consummate, complete, unblamable in point of moral merit. But what then? Have they any moral merit more than they require for themselves? have they any

overplus to convey to another? have they enough for their own selves, and a part for other men too? By no mean. All they do, they were bound to do for their own good; all their virtues and holy exertion they were obliged to make to maintain their own best interest or welfare. If they do anything apart from loving and glorifying God, and apart from loving and benefiting others, and apart from loving and bettering their own selves, they do what is not virtue, what has no moral merit, what is not morality in any man whatever. It follows, that even if men were altogether free from sin, were perfect in virtue, were complete in morality they could not have more moral merit than they would need for themselves, could not have any one particle to spare for any other man. "When ye shall have done all those things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do." Luke, 17: 10.

Subsection IV. We have to remember that men are sinners; that all mankind have fallen from goodness and from God; that the whole world has become guilty and corrupt in the eye of Jehovah; that sin and vice have triumphantly gone over the length and the breadth of our globe. Consequently, so far from having more moral merit than we want for ourselves, we have incomparable less; instead of having too great goodness and virtue, we have immeasurably too little; and instead of having merit to spare to another, we have to depend on the Lord Jesus Christ to transfer his mediatorial merit unto us, that we die not eternally. Now how sinful, preposterous, and vain to boast of human merit! how wicked and absurd to pretend that our own merit is enough for our own selves! how additionally wicked, how consummately absurd to presume that our minute and miserable merit, our contemptible virtue, our despicable moral worth, will suffice not only for our

selves, but even wholly or partly for other people! Oh Popery! Popery! Abandon your peculiar and pestilent doctrine of merit, magnify God, lessen man, exalt the Saviour, humble the sinner, and return to Scriptural truth, to the veritable doctrine of God's own veritable word. Then, Popery, you will appear more nearly meritorious to all men and women, truly scriptural and reasonable. "Can a man be profitable unto God, as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself? If thou be righteous, what givest thou him? or what receiveth he of thine hand?" Job, 22 : 2, and 35 : 7.

SECTION XIII.

PURGATORY, AND PRAYING FOR THE DEAD.

Subsection I. The papal conceit of purgatory, a place whither many souls *in a state of grace, departed in Christ, dead in the Lord*, go, on leaving the body, in order to have a moral purgation, to be freed from their sinful impurity, to be fully prepared for heaven, tends to maintain the unscriptural and dangerous distinction between *venial* and *mortal* sin, and tends to lower and degrade the atonement of our Lord, and tends to limit and narrow the purifying operation of the Holy Ghost, and tends to encourage and aid sin and vice, and tends to promote priestrule, to bring power and importance to the pope and the priesthood. Moreover, we may feel quite sure that the tendency and aptitude of the doctrine to promote priestrule, to magnify and glorify the priesthood, are a leading reason, the leading reason, the main motive of the papal kirk for upholding the

doctrine, a doctrine so delicious to the Roman priestly palate. Purgatory is protected to protect priestrule.*

Subsection II. The notion of purgatory tends to maintain the distinction between *venial* and *mortal* sin, a distinction unscriptural and dangerous.

Firstly. The notion tends to maintain the distinction. According to my view of the purgatorial plan, souls are sent to purgatory to be purged and purified from two things. 1st. Venial sin. 2d. The remainder of mortal sin, or the part left unforgiven by the Lord. As to the former, or venial sin, the removal of it forms so great a part of the work fabled to be done in purgatory, that its difference from mortal sin is important to be upheld by the rigid purgatorian. Without venial sin, papal folk would hardly know what to do with purgatory.

Secondly. The distinction is unscriptural and dangerous. 1st. The distinction between venial and mortal sin, is unscriptural. This view we shall continue to hold till Scripture be pointed out clearly and amply making or showing the distinction. Where in the Bible do we read of venial and mortal sin? No where. 2d. The distinction between venial and mortal sin is dangerous. Men will be apt to imagine nearly all their sins to be venial, or nearly none to be mortal; not only of small ones, but even of great. Moreover, men will be liable to fancy that they have no great sins; for having deemed them venial, they will quickly deem them small. Moreover, men will be too prone to go on from judging their sins to be venial and small, to judge them to be few, and so will get to think that they have but few sins in the whole; for if great can be squeezed into small, many can be squeezed into few. *Venial—Small—Few.*

* The word *Priestrule* is formed of priest and rule, and means the rule or domineering of the priesthood. Moreover, the words *priest-rulive*, *priestrulian*, and the like, come from priestrule.

Behold the purgatorian's estimate of sin! To him sin will no longer appear *exceeding sinful*. Rom. 7: 13.

Subsection III. The notion of purgatory tends to lower and degrade the atonement of our Lord, and to make his satisfaction for sin appear unsatisfactory. According to the purgatory whim, our Lord is an incomplete or partial Saviour, saving merely in part; for he works out one part of our salvation, a third, a half, two-thirds, or less or more, and we ourselves by undergoing purgatorial pain, or the pope and priesthood by delivering us from purgatory, work out the other part. Christ has not done enough, having left a great deal for purgatory to do. He merely began the work of redemption; the sinner himself, or the priest for him, the sinner by suffering, or the priest by succoring, ending the work, or making it complete and available. Purgatory doctrine puts merit in the creature, the sinner largely saving himself by being in purgatory, or the priest largely saving him by bringing him hereout. And by putting merit in man, and making him greatly help the Saviour in saving the soul, the purgatory whim throws Christ into the shade, makes him appear an imperfect redeemer, and leads man to depend not wholly on Divine mercy, but partly and greatly on human merit and priestly power. Christ does much, the sinner does more! the priest does most of all!! Now according to the Bible, Jesus Christ is the only Saviour; but according to purgatory, he is not the only one: therefore purgatory is wrong and unreal, or a mere priestly fable.

"By him (Christ) all that believe are justified from *all things*. Acts, 13: 39. Ye are *complete* in him. Col. 2: 10. He is able to save them *to the uttermost*, that come unto God by him. Heb. 7: 25. The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from *all sin*." 1 John, 1: 7.

Subsection IV. The notion of purgatory tends to limit and narrow the purifying operation of the Holy

Ghost, and to make him a partial purifier, purifying the sinner in part only. Who imagine that the Spirit acts in the way of sanctification in purgatory? that he sanctifies the souls when they are confined there, and prepares them for the sanctity and purity of heaven? Surely none so imagine. We read in Scripture that the Holy Spirit makes holy or purifies people on earth, but read there not a word about his purifying work in purgatory. The Holy Ghost not purifying the souls confined there, who or what does purify them? Are they purified by purgatorial pain, or by their own power, or by the power of the priesthood in granting an indulgence or indulging, or by another thing? Alas! What bad purifiers! But in whatever way they become purified or sanctified, they become so not by the direct and immediate acting of the Holy Ghost; and therefore he must appear, in relation to them, to be no more than a partial purifier or special sanctifier, acting not wholly or generally. In relation to purgatory, we find suffering, or the sinner, or the priesthood, or another thing interfering with what Scripture declares to be the peculiar operation of the Holy Ghost, and doing his proper work, by more or less imparting the new nature and the the holy heart. In fine, according to the Bible, the Spirit is the only sanctifier; but according to purgatory, he is not the only one: therefore purgatory is wrong and unreal, or a mere priestly fable.

Subsection V. Article I. The scheme of purgatory tends to encourage and aid sin and immorality. And the kirk of Rome, by maintaining the doctrine of purgatory, gives encouragement and aid to sin, vice, and crime.

Firstly. If people are made to believe that a place will take them after death, where they may be purged from their sinful propensity and immoral habit, will they be very careful to overcome the propensity and

habit during life ? No. If people are led to think that, maugre a sinful and immoral career on earth, they may be made meet for heaven in purgatory, will they not be tempted, and effectively tempted to put off what they wrongly deem an evil day, the day of leaving their sin and immorality, to delay repentance and conversion to the last hour, and to resolve on becoming virtuous and holy after death, rather than afore ? They will. If people are taught that they may choose between taking up the cross, crucifying their evil doing, and following the Saviour, while they are on earth, and suffering somewhat, more or less, in purgatory, will they not choose the latter, and instead of being renewed by the Holy Ghost, prefer being purified by purgatorial pain, pain that, they flatter themselves, will not be very painful ? They will. Will not men and women cleave to the flesh, the world, and the devil, to anything rather than the holy God, if they may yet get to heaven after undergoing a kind of penance in a place called Purgatory ; a penance that, owing to the intervention of the pope and the priesthood, they hope will be neither very long nor very severe ? They will so cleave. The present, continual, and strong attraction of sin and vice, will overcome the fear of the future, the absent, the dimly seen, the vague and indefinite, the somewhat uncertain and doubtful evil of purgatory fire.

Secondly. With the great majority of people who believe in purgatory, hell is out of the question, and the fear of hell is hurled far away behind the back ; for excepting the uncommonly sinful, the enormously wicked and immoral, the prodigiously and outrageously criminal, purgatory people turn away their eyes from hell, and fix them on purgatory. As to moral power and holy restraining effect on the doing and behavior of the main body of purgatory people, purgatory deplaces hell, pushing it out of the thought, occupying its room,

and usurping its employ. Now hell differs from purgatory in two main points. 1st. Hell is a far more horrible and fearful state and place. 2d. The evidence for hell is clear, conclusive, and convincing; while the evidence for purgatory is nothing, is no evidence at all, the mere unsupported affirmation of the priesthood. Therefore even the ignorant papal laity do not, will not, cannot believe in the reality of purgatory with anything like the degree of strength and energy where-with they believe in the reality of hell. From the foregoing two main points of difference, it follows that the fear of hell has far greater influence than the fear of purgatory; and that if the power of hell in preventing sin and vice, be lamentably small, the power of purgatory therein is incomparably smaller. If the love of sin be hardly subduable by the fear of hell, how can it be subdued by the fear of hell's puny rival? The sin-subduing power of hell is great, extremely great viewed as relative, viewed in relation to that of purgatory; therefore the papal substitution of purgatory for hell is a very great gain to sin, vice, and crime.

Article 2. What is the absolute sin-subduing power of hell? Hell—so horrible and fearful, and so credible and indubitable, even hell has little practical operation absolutely on the life and conduct of very many who firmly and fully believe therein, and keep it in their view; of very many from whose mind it is not driven by the shallow and unfounded whim of purgatory. And as hell can do no more, what can purgatory do, hell's feeble substitute? The fear of hell being found little enough, and even too little to bind and restringe the bad inclination of the great majority of those who have not purgatorial pain in their creed or in their view, what can be said of the far smaller, far less influential fear of purgatory? The fear of hell does too little, the fear of purgatory does far less.

Subsection VI. The scheme of purgatory tends to promote priestrule. Who can keep a soul out of purgatory? The pope and the priesthood! Who can make the purgatorial proceeding of short duration? The pope and the priesthood! Who can make purgatorial pains to be few and small, the purifying penance to be trifling and easy—to be nothing more than mildly putting the soul to right by a kind of gentle purgative? The pope and the priesthood! The people, the laity are taught that the papal priesthood have power over purgatory; power to deliver hereto, and to deliver herefrom, whom they will; power to make the time long or short, and to make the pain great or small, as they like. It follows that the people must believe what the priesthood affirm, and do what the priesthood command, and pay what the priesthood require, or wo be to them in purgatory! The clergy hold purgatory *in terrorem* over the head of the laity to alarm and frighten, in order hereby to rule and enslave them, to turn them how and where they like, to bend their body and soul to the imperious clerical will, and to render them meanly subservient to the power, the profit, the pleasure of the priesthood. That the people may not go to purgatory, or may get on well herein, and get well hereout, they enable the priesthood to get on well in the present world; that their poor laic soul may not bake, or boil, or broil on hot purgatorial fire, and during many a long year, they allow the pope and the priesthood to cram themselves with dainty loaves and fishes, to fatten on the peculiar good things of time and sense, and to revel in the secular advantage of a world that they profess to trample under foot through their extreme self-mortification! Can a plan be devised more likely to render the priesthood everything, and the people nothing, than the purgatorial one? Purgatory is a fable, I know; but it is a "cunningly devised fable." 2 Pet

1: 16. The result of the plan has corresponded to the tendency; for by mean of getting purgatory for the people, the priesthood have gotten earth for themselves. The peculiar merit of the purgatory plan in the eye of the papal priesthood may be inferred from the following phrase of their own: "When the money jingles in the chest, the soul ascends to heaven."

Subsection VII. The tendency and aptitude of the scheme of purgatory to promote priestrule, are the main, the grand recommendation of the scheme to the favor and support of the pope and the priesthood. According to the common principle of human nature, as the purgatory plan will greatly promote and augment the temporal advantage and pleasure of the priesthood, it does greatly incline and allure the priesthood to help and uphold it with all their might. Purgatory favors the priesthood, therefore the priesthood favor purgatory. In beholding the pope and the priesthood arguing for purgatory, Shakspeare would say, "that the wish is father to the thought." They desire it to be true, and then try to prove it so. Their defence and ready help evidently originate in low and sordid interest. Thus it appears that the priestrulative character, and aptitude of the papal purgatory plan, do naturally form a leading reason, a main cause why it is upheld by the kirk of Rome. And as I do not find for the plan any solid ground either in the Bible or in good sense, I infer that its priestrulative character and aptitude form *the* leading reason, *the* main cause why it is upheld. Supposing the papal priesthood to abjure priestrule, to cast far away all priestal domination, to give up usurping the right of the people, they would very soon throw their purgatory overboard, and let it sink into a place worse than itself. Purgatory is protected to protect priestrule,—and the pope is the leading priestrulian.

Subsection VIII. There being no such place or even

state as purgatory, praying God to release a human soul from purgatorial pain is mocking our Maker, flinging insult in the face of Jehovah, and indeed blaspheming! No such place or state as purgatory existing, praying God to deliver herefrom is praying him to deliver from nowhere, from nothing,—is entreating him to do what is not to be done. The prayer and entreaty originate in folly or in impiety, and terminate in vanity or in something worse. Instead of irrationally asking the Lord to transfer from purgatory to heaven, departed souls who are already either in heaven or in hell, let us faithfully ask him to prepare ourselves for his heavenly beatitude, to justify us through Jesus Christ, to sanctify us by the Holy Ghost, and hereby to hinder us from descending to everlasting night, to the gloomy world of wo!

Subsection IX. Praying for the dead, for the souls pretendedly confined in purgatory, is the offspring of priestly cunning, a mere invention of the priesthood, intended to promote their professional power and the like, to make them more important in the eyes of the people, and to forward their plans of carnal good. Praying for the dead is an unscriptural thing, having not a shadow of authority in any part of the word of God. "The dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward. Neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun." Eccles. 9 : 5, 6.

SECTION XIV.

PRIESTAL ABSOLUTION AND EXCOMMUNICATION.

Subsection I. This doctrine appears to imply an ample amount of ignorance, presumption, pride, and blasphemy. What does the doctrine mean when fully carried out, when taken in its whole extent, in its length, breadth, and depth? It means that the papal priesthood may absolve from sin whom they like; may pardon the transgression, forgive the iniquity, remove the condemnation of any number of people, or leave it undone, as they may happen to prefer; may admit men and woman to heaven, to eternal joy, or retain them under the load of guilt, under the curse of the broken law, under the dreadful anger of Jehovah, according to their own priestly discretion! It means that the papal priesthood, for any reason that they may deem adequate, may excommunicate any number of people to any degree they like, even from glory and God, even to everlasting wo, shutting them up in the never-ending misery of hell! It means that the pope and the priesthood keep and control the two great states of the future world; that they hold the keys of heaven and hell, opening and shutting to whom they will, when they will, and how they will; that they are the arbiters or deciders of salvation and damnation, saving all whom they choose to save, and damning all whom they choose to damn!

Who are the men that claim the awful and fearful power, the power to save and damn? What are they? The pope and the priesthood, are they a company of angels living on earth in the character of God's plenipotentiaries, of our Redeemer's viceroys, of secondary gods? Or are they people inspired, people extraordi-

narily, miraculously, prophetically guided by the Holy Ghost; people directly and immediately superintended and controlled by the Divine Being? Or are they men full of knowledge, and full of virtue; men perfect in wisdom, and perfect in piety; men in whom intellect and holiness appear to be embodied, and to be living visibly, and acting directly; men who stand at the top of humanity, being saints in perfection, and fully ripe for the joy and glory of heaven? Alas! In general, in relation to the main body, to the majority, the pope and the priesthood have been men of quite another kind, men as different from the foregoing as darkness is from light, sin from holiness, evil from good. Many, very many of them have been men without holiness, and with no great intellect; men of no piety, and of little wisdom; men with virtue below par, and with knowledge not above; vicious and ignorant, wicked and weak, having crime and folly. Many a pope, and many, very many a priest have been utterly void of holiness or piety; and been full of irreligion, immorality, guilt, and corruption; and been grovelling in ignorance or mental night. In fine, a great majority of the papal priesthood have had small sense, and smaller sanctity, or no sanctity at all. A great majority have been wholly destitute and empty of genuine godliness, personal piety, real religion, converting grace; and a great minority have abounded in sin, run riot in immorality, and taken their fill of crime, wallowing in wickedness, and actively serving the flesh, the world, and the devil.* Bernard wrote the following pithy period: "The bishops, to whom the church of God is now committed, are not teachers, but seducers; not pastors, but imposters; not prelates, but Pilates." An odd character (given by a leading papal writer) of the ecclesiastical head of the

* See the character of the popes, section II, argument first.

papal kirk. *Seducers—Impostors—Pilates!* And Bridget, I think, called the pope and priesthood *murderers of souls*; and affirmed that they turned the ten commandments into two words, *Da Pecuniam*, Give money!

Verily, verily we are bound to inquire if the awful and fearful power claimed by the papal priesthood be claimed on solid and sufficient ground; we are interested in knowing what authority they have either from revelation or from reason. We have a right to see and examine their credential, to make them produce their voucher, and to require a full statement of the argument and proof they pretend to have for their priestly demand. We are concerned to know by whom they are sent, and what they are sent to do. We may claim to be convinced that they have God's plenipotent commission, afore we regard them as armed with God's power, and sitting on the judgment-seat of the world, determining the future doom, the everlasting weal or wo of millions of immortal beings!

Subsection II. Article I. Priestal Absolution. I remember to have read or heard of a little girl who went to a priest to be absolved, when the following dialogue occurred. As I quote from memory, I undertake only to be substantially correct, or correct in the main.

G. "Good Father, can you absolve me from my sin? P. Yes. G. How do you know that you can? P. The Holy Church and the Bible tell me so. G. What must you do to absolve me? P. Read over to you the proper passages of Scripture. G. What passages are they? P. This, and that, and t'other, and the like. G. Is the reading of the passages the whole that you would do in absolving me? P. It is, and it would be quite enough. G. What would you charge for your absolution? P. The sum of * * * G. Good father, I shall save my money, for I shall go home and absolve myself. You tell me that reading over particular passages of the

Bible is enough to absolve me; and I am sure that I may as well read them myself, as trouble your reverence to read them. Therefore I shall go home, get a Bible, read the passages, and save my money. Your servant, good father."

Article 2. The little girl was right. The little girl could absolve as well as the priest. Any man, woman, or child can absolve as well as the pope of Rome; and certainly the patriarch of Constantinople, the archbishop of Canterbury, the moderator of the General Assembly of the kirk of Scotland, or other ministers, could absolve as well as the proud pontiff of the Italian city. What can any priestal personage do? Nothing more than declare the following truth: "If you really return to God, God will absolve you; if you truly repent of your sins, he will pardon them." Now is the priest the only one who can so declare? the only one who can make the delightful announcement? No. Any other person can make it equally with the priest. Indeed any old woman or little girl can absolve as well as any papal priest in Christendom. Priestal absolution, that daring invention of Rome, is a farce and a fable; is a piece of humbug, and a solemn exhibition of hypocrisy; is a thing of quackery and quixotism; is an example of arrogance and impudence; is a mark of professional vanity, professional folly, and professional fraud. The papal pretension to absolve, is presumption, pride, and blasphemy. N. B. Of course, I here take the word absolution to mean absolution not conditional or declarative only, but absolute or judicial; the absolution that has been a mighty and fearful engine of papal Rome.*

* Priests in Protestant lands affect to deny, and do deny obstinately, that they profess to pardon sin as judges; they say they merely pronounce absolution and pardon in God's name, upon the penitence of the sinner. To expose this imposition I shall quote the decree of the Council of Trent on this point, "Si quis dixerit, &c. If any

Article 3. Priestal absolution is not according to Holy Scripture—to the Bible.

Firstly. We read not a word in the Bible, read nothing in either Testament for the doctrine, in favor of absolution by people not inspired, by people not extraordinarily, miraculously, prophetically guided by the Holy Ghost. Absolution from sin by people not directly and immediately superintended and controlled by the Divine Being, has not one particle of authority, has not one jot, tittle, or iota of support, or even shadow of support, in Holy Scripture.

Secondly. The Bible is even against priestal absolution; not only not for, but even against. Many passages of Holy Writ are strongly counter to the presumptuous, proud, and blasphemous doctrine. The whole current of Scripture, the genius and spirit, the practice, and the words are all arrayed in opposition to the plan of people having their sin forgiven by an uninspired priest, and one who is, perhap, far more sinful than themselves. On this part of the subject, however, I have no time to enlarge; so I refer the reader either to the Bible itself, or to writers who formally handle the point.

Article 4. Priestal absolution is not according to reason, to good sense, to pure logical wisdom.

Firstly. What papal priest can bring a solid argument from reason in favor of the scheme? Not one. Reason is by no mean for the doctrine, giving no countenance shall say that the sacramental absolution of the priest is *not* a JUDICIAL ACT, but a naked *pronunciation and declaring* that sins are remitted to the person confessing, provided only that he believes, &c. let him be anathema." Hence it is a formal and judicial act of the priest, sitting as judges, in Christ's stead, uttering the sentence of pardon! See Council, Trid. Sess. 14, Can. 9. This is the Roman genuine doctrine as enacted and promulged "by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost," who, they say, guided that council.

W. C. B.

tenance at all to the wild revery, utterly refusing to sanction, in any manner or form, the bold and baneful blasphemy.

Secondly. Reason is even against the doctrine; not only not for, but even against. I will give three solid arguments from reason in opposition to the doctrinal monster.

1st. People not inspired, not extraordinarily, miraculously, prophetically guided by God, cannot know who really return to him, cannot understand who truly repent of their sin; therefore they cannot know whom to absolve, cannot understand whom to forgive. Through their natural ignorance, uninspired people may absolve those who have not repented, and refuse absolution to those who have; may admit sinners into heaven, and keep saints out.

2nd. Uninspired people, people not directly and immediately superintended and controlled by the Divine Being, are quite unworthy to be trusted with so awful a charge, so fearful a power as that of absolving, of pardoning sin; for their passion might master their reason, and lead them to hold the scale of justice unequally, wrongfully, unjustly. Such people are liable to prejudice and party feeling; are moved and turned by like of one, and by dislike of another; have their favorite, their friend, and their foe; those to whom their affections incline, and those from whom their affections recede. Now, truly, the like people are altogether unfit to hold the balance of Divine Justice, to weigh the moral good and evil of mankind, and to decide who may, and who may not enter the kingdom of heaven, and live with God for ever.

3rd. When we speak of the papal priesthood, we speak not of one, but of many; not of one man, but of many hundreds of thousands of men. Now these men not being inspired, not being illumined and led by the

Holy Ghost, may not agree about absolution, some saying yea, and others saying nay. One may say a man shall be absolved, another may say he shall not; one may absolve him to-day, another may unabsolve him to-morrow: one is pushing him into heaven, another is pulling him back to earth. Many men, many minds. Many a priest, many a plan.

Article 5. Firstly. As to the uncommon powers given to the apostles and other inspired people, I do not pretend to know their full measure and extent. That the apostles and other like people were empowered to absolve, to forgive sin, is very far more than I clearly and certainly know. I am very doubtful of their power to absolve. There is something mystical and darkly declared, or something prophetically figurative and sacredly symbolical in the words of Christ given in the three passages that appear to relate to the point. "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained. John, 20. Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven. Matt. 18: 18. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Matt. 16: 19. Finding some difficulty in determining the strict and accurate meaning of the three passages from the wording, we may review the practice of the apostles and other inspired people, as giving us a key to the meaning. Now where do we find any apostle or any other inspired person undertaking to absolve? No where. Where in Scripture do we read of any man or woman pardoning sin, forgiving iniquity, and removing, directly and immediately, the burden of guilt? No where. People are

directed to the Lord for absolution, are sent to God or to Christ for pardon and for peace. "Who can forgive sins, but God only?" Mark, 2: 7; Luke, 5: 21.

Secondly. But even if apostles, and other inspired people, men or women extraordinarily, miraculously, prophetically guided by the Holy Ghost, men or women directly and immediately superintended and controlled by the Divine Being, did absolve; even if they did pardon sin, and free the soul from the curse of the broken law; they were not in this point examples for us, where not herein patterns for priests in our day, who are not endowed with their superhuman power. A modern priest is uninspired; therefore let him not presume to equal an apostle. What an apostle and other like man or woman did in prosecution of their formal, official, inspirational, miraculous duty, the Holy Ghost himself may be said to have done, the Holy Ghost acting indirectly and mediately, acting through him or her as a medium or instrument.

Thirdly. I deem it right to remark that the former two of the foregoing three passages were spoken not to the apostles only, but to the disciples, to the kirk; not to the priestal part merely, but to the popular or laical too; to the whole, to the general body of kirk-members. And in 1 Tim. 3: 15, Paul declares the kirk, not the priesthood only, but the kirk,—whereof the people or laity are far the greater or more numerous part,—Paul declares the kirk to be "the pillar and ground of the truth."

Article 6. Indulgence may be taken for a species of absolution. Absolution from sin future, may be indulgence; absolving from sin to be committed in time to come, may be indulging. Speaking in the language of logic, the *specific difference* is futurity. Absolution from sin, is the genus; absolution from sin future, is the species termed indulgence. Indulgence, however, has often

a meaning different from the foregoing, its meaning being various and vague.

In the dictionary of Dr. Ash, indulgence is defined to be, "A grant from the Church of Rome to be exempt from rigorous virtue." What a grant! A grant to indulge in sin and vice! a grant to disobey and offend God! a grant to do what tends to damn, and what may damn the miserable doer! a grant to go to hell! Could hell itself, could all the devils combined contrive a grant more infernal and diabolical?

Maybe a papite will tell me that the grant of exemption from being rigorously virtuous, or doing rigorous virtue, keeps one from having vice, or renders one innocent in not so being or not so doing. Not to be or do according to rigorous virtue, if we have not the grant of exemption, is immoral, but if we have the grant, is moral. We are vicious or virtuous accordingly as we have not or have the grant of exemption. So far a papite. But I desire to put a query. Has the Lord authorized the kirk of Rome to make the grant of exemption, and hereby to render moral what afore was immoral? No. He has not. God has not allowed any man or men to alter the nature of vice or virtue, or to make what is vice to-day, to be virtue to-morrow. The papal pretended grant is mere presumption and profanity, a thing utterly invalid, a thing without power or effect in the court of heaven and the pure eye of Jehovah. "A grant to be exempt from rigorous virtue."—Alas! It would require all the power of God himself to make the grant, even if he could make it. It follows that "a grant from the kirk of Rome to be exempt from rigorous virtue," is nothing better than a grant to live in vice, and to go to hell!

Article 7. The main field, however, for the operation of indulgence, is purgatory. Remitting the sin of a soul in purgatory, and enabling it to go from purgatory to

heaven, is termed not absolution, but indulgence. On earth, people are absolved; in purgatory, they are indulged. If you have a relative or friend *dead in the Lord, departed in Christ, in a state of grace*, now suffering torment in purgatory, in a place existing nowhere, and if you are willing liberally to pay the pope and priesthood, they will indulge him by letting him out,—out of nowhere! But remember, to save your relative, you have to sacrifice your pocket; for the pope and priesthood do not perform purgatory-work for nothing. Some quack doctors proclaim, *No cure, no pay!* The pope and priesthood proclaim the reverse, *No pay, no cure! no money, no mercy! no gold, silver or copper, no heaven! no hard coin, or good bank notes payable on demand, no release from purgatorial pain!* Gideon Ouseley, in his telling letters to *John Thayer*, declares that the pope and priesthood have less regard and pity for a human soul than people have for an ox or an ass! For if the latter find an ox or ass in a pit, they help it out instantler; whereas the former will not help a soul out of purgatory till they are well paid for their help! We ought to bear in mind, however, that people are quite certain in relation to the pit, and that the pope and priesthood of Rome have pretty strong internal conviction that purgatory is a fable. For while the former hasten to rescue the poor animal from the real evil of the ditch or pit, the latter are not over ready and active in delivering the human soul from the unreal and imaginary evil of the prison or dungeon of purgatory. To do a possibility gratis or for nothing is beyond the common virtue of our wicked world; but to do an impossibility without pay or fee, by unrewardedly bringing souls from purgatory, from a place that has not existed and does not exist, is quite above the range of *popean* and priestal philanthropy, and would be deemed charity gone mad.

Article 8. We have to remember that the papal priesthood often do not *give* absolution and indulgence, but *sell* them, getting money or the like for them directly or indirectly. It appears that Babylon, Roman Babylon, traded in *bodies and souls of men*. Rev. 18 : 13. Now the sale of absolution and indulgence by the great whore, *The Mother of Harlots*, Rev. 17, affords a woful exemplification of the traffic in human souls. By daring to absolve from sin, when God does not absolve, and to indulge to sin, though God does never so indulge, the papal whore leads mankind blindfold to everlasting ruin, in return for their confidence and their money! By directly and immediately selling her abominable absolution and infamous indulgence to the people, she indirectly and mediately sells their poor soul to sin, Satan and hell! In this tremendous trade her exports are human souls and bodies too, her place of debarkation is hell, and her dealers are the devils! What are her imports? Her proximate imports are sums of money and the like; her ultimate ones are—let the reader conceive! I hope, sincerely hope, that real repentance and Divine absolution, absolution by God, will timely intervene for these papal promoters of damnation, saving their souls from the never-dying worm, and their bodies from unquenchable fire! Mark, 9 : 44, 46, 48; Isa. 66 : 24.

Subsection III. Article 1. Priestal Excommunication. This is a two-headed, two-bellied monster; in other words, two kinds of priestal excommunication have been claimed by the papal priesthood, or one kind having two degrees; or one excommunication referring to two worlds, to time and eternity, or to earth and hell. 1st. Excommunication or expulsion from the visible kirk, from kirk privilege, from the outward communion of saints. 2nd. Excommunication to hell. N. B. If the reader desire special and formal proof in this matter,

he may consult the noted form termed "*Cursing by bell, book and candle.*"

Though popery treats the foregoing two excommunications as one, or as joined together; or though the kirk of Rome views a man when excommunicated or expelled from her visible or exterior pale, as virtually or consequentially excommunicated or doomed to infernal ruin, going on the plan of exclusive salvation, or salvation confined to her own pale, (aloof from popery, aloof from christianity! or unjoined to the pope, unjoined to Christ!) yet I handle excommunication as a two-fold thing, because there are two essentially or abstractedly, and because there undoubtedly were at first held to be two according to theory or abstract order, expelling from the visible kirk having been originally deemed separate and distinct from delivering to damnation. Putting from the visible kirk, and sending to hell, are here mentioned as two and different, the former not implying the latter, and not being originally deemed to imply it.

Article 2. We might, perhap, speak of excommunication to purgatory, power to send there having, perhap, been claimed by the papal priesthood. If, however, an objector be inclined to cavil about the precise or exact when, where, and how the power has been claimed, I cannot go into detail at present, and therefore reply, in brief and in general, somewhen, somewhere, and somehow. Indeed it would be difficult to bring the charge home by formal proof derived from official documents; for the pope and Roman priesthood presume rather to keep in, and to deliver from purgatory, than to send thither, as the great majority of good people are affirmed to go to purgatory afore going to heaven. It being, however, probable that the papal priesthood have assumed the power of sending people to purgatory, even those who otherwise would not be pronounced likely to

go thither, we may, on account of accuracy and order, speak of excommunication to purgatory.

Excommunication to purgatory is a point that will not detain us long. Purgatory being a "cunningly devised fable," 2 Peter, 1 : 16, excommunication to purgatory would be a mere solemn foolery and humbug, and therefore deserves no farther attention, and will not again be brought into view. I merely say here, in passing, that even if there were such a place as purgatory, the pretence of the pope and the priesthood of being able to excommunicate thereto of their own accord, of their own will and pleasure, would be nothing less than presumption, pride, and blasphemy.

Article 3. Excommunication or expulsion from the visible kirk is an act that may be done by the kirk when the kirk has good ground for doing so. Every kirk must have power and authority to perform this part of discipline, as well as to perform two other like parts hereof, the three like parts of discipline being admission, correction, expulsion. Every kirk has naturally the power to admit, correct, expel all who ought to be admitted, corrected, expelled. Not only every kirk, however, but every other voluntary society must be viewed as having within itself the trinal power of admitting, correcting, expelling members. Where, however, or in whom (in the kirk) the trinal power fairly resides, in one, or in a few, or in the many, is a point that I am not called here to examine. It is a nice point, and one whereon all protestants do not agree, and one, therefore, that I, as a protestant advocate, do well to waive. But I may remark, that whatever power properly belongs to the clergy, they ought not altogether to disregard the laity, to tarow their judgment and feeling quite in the background or on one side, to deem them void of all claim to attention, and to treat them little better than so many beasts of burden. Now this is what popery has done

It has allowed nothing to the people, but given everything to the priesthood; making the former feeble, powerless, and fearful; and the latter absolute, omnipotent, and daring. The papal priesthood have expelled, corrected, and the like, with about as entire a disregard and contempt for the popular judgment, feeling, and desire, as if the people were a set of mere nonentities, or things fit to be trodden on, or fit for blindly obeying, and for nothing better. Now truly this is wrong, and lamentably wrong, being opposed to fair dealing, to kind feeling, to man's judgment, to God's will, and to God's word. It follows that the peculiarly, pre-eminently, and offensively exclusive priestly pretension of Rome to excommunicate or expel from the visible kirk, or her plan of proceeding herein, is presumption and pride. What can be said for papal excommunication of kings, princes, and the like? Surely there is presumption and pride. And it is said that popes have punished sovereign princes with excommunication *sixty* times or oftener. Gregory VII. or Hildebrand excommunicated the emperor Henry IV. Pius V. excommunicated queen Elizabeth. Innocent III. excommunicated king John of England. And a papal Bull declared the great Charter to be null and void, and excommunicated the barons who signed it; and the Bull has never been repealed.* Often has popery "turned religion into rebellion, and faith into faction."

Article 4. Excommunication to hell is a graver affair. The papal fancy of priestal excommunication to hell, differs from, and is worse than the papal fancy of

* Yet the priests and advocates of Rome quote this bold spirit of civil liberty on the part of the barons as a proof that the Roman catholic religion breathes the true spirit of liberty. These "Catholic barons achieved the MAGNA CHARTA!" Yes, but their pope,—the infallible head,—excommunicated the barons, and declared MAGNA CHARTA to be null and void!—W. C. B.

priestal non-absolution, in two main points. 1st. Non-absolution is not saving; excommunication to hell is damning. By the former, the priesthood let people die: by the latter, they kill them. In the one way, they do them no good; in the other way, they do them positive harm. 2nd. If the priesthood do merely not absolve, they leave people a chance of absolution from the Lord himself, leave them the benefit of application to heaven; but if they excommunicate to hell, they make people's damnation certain and irrevocable, they exclude them from hope, they unite them with eternal despair!

A little girl can excommunicate to hell, as well as a priest. Any man, woman, or child can excommunicate as well as the pope of Rome; and certainly the patriarch of Constantinople, the archbishop of Canterbury, the moderator of the General Assembly of the kirk of Scotland, or other ministers, could excommunicate as well as the proud pontiff of the Italian city. Any old woman or little girl can excommunicate as well as any papal priest in christendom. The papal pretension to excommunicate to hell, is presumption, pride and blasphemy. See last subsection.

Priestal excommunication to hell, is not according to Holy Scripture. Firstly. We read not a word in the Bible, read nothing in either Testament, for the doctrine, in favor of excommunication to hell by people not inspired. Secondly. The Bible is even against priestal excommunication to hell; not only not for, but even against. I cannot stay, however, to handle the point fully and at large; so I refer the reader either to the Bible itself, or to writers who formally handle the point. See last subsection.

Priestal excommunication to hell is not according to reason, to good sense, to clear wisdom and logic. Firstly. What priest can bring a solid argument from reason in favor of the scheme? Not one. Reason is

by no mean for the doctrine. Secondly. Reason is even against the doctrine ; not only not for, but even against. I will give three arguments. 1st. People uninspired cannot know the real state of individuals, cannot search the heart, cannot see through the soul, cannot be acquainted with the secret thought and inward feeling ; therefore they cannot know who ought, and who ought not to be excommunicated to hell. 2nd. People uninspired are utterly unworthy to be trusted with the awful and fearful power of deciding on damnation ; for their passion might master their reason, and lead them to hold the scale of justice unequally, wrongfully, unjustly. 3rd. The papal priesthood being many, and being uninspired, may not agree about excommunication to hell ; some saying yea, and others saying nay ; some pushing people in, and others pulling them out. Many men, many minds. Many a priest, many a plan. See last subsection.

Firstly. I do not pretend fully to know if the Apostles and other inspired people could excommunicate to hell. That they were empowered so to do, is very far more than I clearly and certainly know. I am very doubtful of their power to damn. Where do we find any apostle or other inspired person undertaking to excommunicate to hell ? Nowhere. Where in Scripture do we read of any inspired man or woman sending people to final perdition ? Nowhere. The Lord only is represented as "able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matt. 10 : 28 ; Luke, 12 : 5. Paul indeed speaks of *delivering unto Satan*. "To deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. 1 Cor. 5 : 5. Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander ; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." 1 Tim. 1 : 20. Now I do not pretend to know the full, exact and unquestionable meaning of the words—*Deliver*

vering unto Satan. It is however quite clear and certain that the apostle does not mean delivering to damnation, excommunicating to hell, in the former passage ; and it is very highly probable that he does not mean it in the latter * Secondly. But even if apostles and other inspired people did excommunicate to hell, even if they did damn, they were not in this point examples for us, were not herein patterns for priests in our day, who are not endowed with their superhuman power. Priests nowadays are not apostles, are not inspired ; and therefore ought not to presume to act as if they were. What the apostles, the prophets, and other like people did in prosecution of their formal, official, inspirational, miraculous duty, the Holy Ghost himself may be said to have done, he acting through them as his appointed mediums. See last subsection.

Subsection IV. Priestal Absolution and Excommunication directly and immediately tend to promote priest-rule or priestcraft, priestrulive power ; they lead to the aggrandizement of the priesthood ; enable the pope and the priest to gratify their ambition, and thirst of power, and control, to forward their monetary interest, to satiate their worldly and sensual desire, to indulge their carnal appetite, and to pamper their flesh to the full. What power, both private and public, has not this dreadful doctrine enabled the priesthood to acquire and retain ? The doctrine has enabled the papal priesthood to be lordly, tyrannical, and cruel ; to abound in worldly wealth, shaking hands and sitting down with Mammon ; and to satiate all their sensual and carnal propensity. Who that know human nature, and the private life of

* There being no such place or even state as purgatory, the words, "*Delivering unto Satan*," cannot mean delivering to purgatory, or excommunicating to purgatorial pain. Purgatory being a fable, we cannot understand the apostle to mean that he sent three men there-to, sent them to nowhere, to nothing.

popery, do not believe that a priest has often absolved a man in return for the man's giving him a sum of money, or for some like thing? Who do not believe that a priest has often absolved a woman, in return for her giving him a sum of money, or for some like thing; or in return for her lending of herself to the work of prostitution, submitting to all the impure will of her priestly absolver? See section XII, subsection VI.

The direct and immediate tendency and aptitude of the arrogant and impudent, of the presumptuous, proud, and blasphemous doctrine now under review, to promote priestrule, to admove the secular prosperity, and confirm the temporal advantage of the Roman clergy at the expense of the laity, are the grand recommendation of the doctrine to the favor of the priesthood; are the leading reason, the main cause why the doctrine has been so fiercely and hotly maintained. The doctrine is upheld, not because it is true, for it is untrue, but because it is priestrulative. In battling for the prerogative of absolving and excommunicating, papal priests have battled for the privilege of abounding in power and of extracting from the purse; and they have battled for the former, for the sake of the latter; for the former in name, for the latter in reality. The battle has been long, destructive and bloody. If they could domineer and rule with absolute mastery, as well without as with absolution, absolution might go to the wind. If they could nestle in the honey-pots of earth, could attain an exclusive familiarity with the good cheer of the flesh, the world and the devil, without the trouble of excommunicating, excommunication might away to the mole and the bat. Their infallible and sacred selves desire, and long, and pant to be not absolvers, but *absolutes*; not excommunicators, but *exclusives*; absolutes in rule, exclusives in exemption. The papal priesthood view and value absolution and excommunication as the mere

means to a carnal end ; they dare to invade both heaven and hell, in order to complete their possession of earth See section 12, subsection 7.

SECTION XV.

AURICULAR CONFESSION.

Subsection I. "Confess your faults one to another," wrote James, chapter 5 verse 16. But how ? How are we to confess ? In the following fourfold way : Laical to laical,—laical to clerical,—clerical to laical,—clerical to clerical,—as the case may demand. In mentioning clerical to laical, I hope I do not infringe on what rightly belongs to the clergy. I say nothing in opposition to what fairly pertains to them ; but only say that cases may occur wherein a clerical will find good in confessing to a laical. And surely the wise and worthy of laity and clergy will agree with me herein, and will admit that a clergyman may derive benefit from opening his mind or confessing to an older, wiser, holier layman. What wise and pious clergyman would think himself above laying open his mind to laics like Boyle, Hale, Wilberforce, or Hannah More ? Truly not Fletcher, Baxter, Leighton, or Usher. Moreover, confess not always covertly, closely, privately, but sometime overtly, openly, publicly, as the thing may require. Moreover, employ the confession as a thing utile and desirable, but not indispensable to salvation. Deem it a help in the way to heaven, but a help that you can do without.

Now mark the guile and wile of the papal priesthood, the "cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to de-

ceive." Eph. 4 : 14. Note three things. 1st. Instead of the foregoing quadruple way, the way of common reason and fair doing, papal cunning and double-dealing have contrived to narrow the practice to the single way of laical to clerical. I must allow that popery does, to a degree, practise the confession of clerical to clerical ; but this kind is a matter of inferior note, is thought little of, and is soon hurried over. The confessional doing is mainly or nearly confined to the one way of laical to clerical. 2d. Moreover, instead of doing the thing with due and opportune publicity, and in the well-timed presence of a friend, of one or more, the priesthood have managed for the priest and the person confessing to be commonly in private, they two shut up together in dual secrecy, in a retired room, aloof from observation and control by a third party, by other people ; no matter who or what the priest, old or young, good or bad ; no matter who or what the confitent, a weak-minded man, a person near death and *about to make a will*, an innocent young girl, or a married woman ! 3d. Moreover, the priesthood pretend that confession *made secretly to the priest alone*, is indispensable to salvation ! pretend that we must either confess to the priest, and in private, or be damned ! They pretend that people cannot be saved without confessing to a priest. For the pope and priesthood really have gone so far in the way of pride and presumption, as to affirm that confession to a priest is indispensable to salvation ; that without going to the confessional, either in act or in desire, we cannot go to heaven. According to their pretending, no priest, no pardon ! no confession to a clerical, no compassion from God ! Their pretension, however, is mere profane folly. A multitude are in heaven who never confessed to any clerical. Query. To what priest have Quakers gone to confess, or desired to go ? To none but our great High Priest—Jesus the Son of God. Heb. 4 : 14.

And what priest having reason, Scripture, and candor, will dare to affirm that all Quakers are damned? Without confessing to God, indeed, we may not hope for heaven; but the omniscient, omnipotent, and holy God is infinitely different from an ignorant, feeble, and sinful priest. Furthermore, the priesthood pretend that people cannot be saved without confessing to a priest secretly or in private. They tell that we must not only confess to the priest, but confess to him when alone; confessing not only to a man peccable and fallible, sinning and erring, but even to his private ear, in secret, under cover, in the moral dark of retired situation and unnatural and corrupting concealment.

Reader, remember the three things in Auricular Confession as papally carried on. 1st. People to priesthood. 2nd. Confessor and confitent, or rather *confessee* and *confessor* commonly in private. 3rd. Confession pretendedly indispensable to salvation. Now in the foregoing three things we find that the priesthood have put the single way in the room of the quadruple one—that they have put the covert for the overt—that they have put unavoidable for utile.

Subsection II. Auricular Confession, as it has been carried on, namely, people to priesthood, and priest and confitent commonly in private, and the thing made a necessary condition or a *sine qua non*, has been a practice leading to far more evil than good, to very great evil and to very small good, and therefore to great evil on the whole. To be at once both brief and clear, I affirm that the practice or custom has given ground to the following five evils, with many more.

1st. It has lowered the people, and heightened the priesthood. It has directly put the stamp of inferiority on the laical many, and of superiority on the clerical few, hereby filling the former with degradation, and the latter with pride. It has greatly augmented priestal

pride, the pride of the pope and priesthood of Rome

2nd. By making the priesthood acquainted with the secrets of the people, with all secrets of all, it has magnified their power at the expense of the people; it has made them strong, and the people weak; it has made the priesthood threatening and tyrannical lords, and the people fearful and trembling slaves. The pope and very many a papal priest erect a heavy throne on the bodies and souls of the people, and crush them beneath the weight of their dreadful despotism.

3rd. By making the priests acquainted with the affairs and the property of people, and with their intention in regard to bequeathing their property, it has enabled them to bias the mind of the will-maker, to influence the making of the will, and to turn a portion of the property to the kirk, that is, to the priesthood, the kirk and the priesthood being, in papally priestal eyes, one and same thing. By enabling the priesthood to get many a bequest and legacy made in their favor, it has brought them money and land at the cost of comparative poverty to the wife and children, having made them opulent, and the wife and children indigent. It has pauperated many a lawful heir, to enrich a greedy priesthood; it has often rendered the natural claimant a beggar, to cram the coffer of the papal kirk, to add to the well-filled purse of the Roman clergy, to enable the self-termed sole successors of the poor apostles to wallow in worldly wealth.

4th. By giving the priesthood an opportunity of poisoning the moral principle, corrupting the mind, and working on the passion of women, it has enabled them to indulge in sensuality, to play the lewdster with their female confitents, and to seduce many a girl and woman who came to confess and to be absolved. A large amount of seduction, fornication, and adultery, has come

from the confessional. By mean of going to the priest in private to confess their sin, many females have been led to vice and whoredom, and been utterly undone. Instead of being improved from sinful to holy, they have been made immoral, abandoned, lewd, and lost. Their *confessor* has been their corrupter; and instead of taking away their sin, has robbed them of their virtue, plundered them of their chastity, and made them twofold more children of hell than they were afore. Matt. 23: 15.

I quote the following from *William Howitt's popular History of Priestcraft*, chapter 14: "Father Anthony Joseph has remained there eight years past, continually plunged in the abominable practice of sinning with women at the time they come to confess, and even in the place where he confessed them; after which he gave them absolution, and administered the Sacrament to them! He told them that these actions need not give them any concern, since all their Fathers, the Bishops, and the Pope himself, observed the same practice!"

5th. By giving the priesthood great and undue influence with kings and ministers of state, it has enabled the former to wield an unhappy power over the latter in political doing, to the great and lasting evil of nations. The priestly confessor of the politician, particularly if a Jesuit, (the Jesuit confessors being the worst of all,) has often planned and promoted political intrigue, and brought about change and confusion, to the ruin of many an individual and family, to the misery of the state, and to the grave dishonor of religion. Auricular confession has been a national evil, a public calamity, a dark and threatening spirit or ill-intending demon hovering over the length and the breadth of the land. What made the king or the queen, the minister or the general do this or that bad thing? The cursed counsel of the confessor!

poisoning the ear, hardening the heart, and urging the hand to persecution, tyranny and blood !*

Subsection III. Firstly. We have to take care so to confess to man as not to postpone confessing to God. Confession to man, if properly done, is good ; confession to God is infinitely better. The opinion, counsel, and experience of wise and holy people may avail us much ; their faithful, fervent, persevering prayer may avail us more. But we may not stop there ; we may not imagine that confessing to man is all we have to do. It is indeed but a small part, a desirable mean to a far more weighty end. We may confess to man, in order to learn more fully how to confess to God. God only knows all our sin, and God only can absolve us herefrom ; to him, therefore, let all confess, and from him let all obtain absolution. Our Father in heaven is the best father confessor ; the foot of the cross is the best confessional ; and humbly and truly confessing to God through Christ is the best way of being freed from the burden of sin, and of procuring pardon, purity, peace and joy.

Secondly. Has auricular confession been carried on according to the spirit of these remarks, and in the manner here pointed out ? Alas ! Without referring to the five evils mentioned in last subsection, we have too great reason to infer that it has not been so carried on. We have too great reason to conclude that, in the papal kirk, confession to man has been all in all ; has been taken not for a mean to a greater end, but for the end itself ; has been viewed as an adequate substitute for

* The Jesuit confessor of Louis XIV, king of France, was the cause of that priest-ruled tyrant's revoking the Edict of Nantz, and shedding the blood of unnumbered thousands ; and of his urging the duke of Savoy to massacre the Waldenses, and of the last two kings of the Stuart line of England persecuting the puritans and Scottish covenanters.—W. C. B.

confession to God, and as serving in its room. With the majority of the followers of the deluded and deluding kirk of Rome, confessing to a priest, with perhaps being absolved by him, has been viewed as a kind of moral whitewashing that, by having set them free from former sin, enabled them to sin again without great fear of having too much sin at one time, of being overstocked with sin, of causing a glut in the moral or immoral market. Having paid, as they have fancied, their old debt due to God, they have held themselves entitled to run into a new one; having cleared off the old score without great trouble, they have been hardened and induced to go and sin anew. The confessional has not been the way to the Shekinah and the Mercy-seat; auricular confession in the chamber of a priest has not helped the confitent to become a real scriptural penitent before the throne of God. The priest confessee has not led the confessor to Jesus Christ and God, but has thrown them into the shade; for he has acted as their plenipotentiary representative, or rather as their rival. And, hence, by the confessional, and by priestly absolution, innumerable souls are annually and daily ruined for ever! They confess to the priest, and not to God. They seek pardon from a priest, and not through the Lord Jesus Christ. For the canon of the Council of Trent, session 14, canon 9, declares that a priest pardons sin "by a *judicial act*," as a judge occupying the place of Christ; and it utters the church's *anathema* on all those who deny it to be a "*judicial act*," and make it a mere *declarative act* of pardon.

SECTION XVI.

CELIBATE OF THE CLERGY.

Subsection I. If I were asked what solid argument is found either in the Holy Scriptures, or in right reason, for this papal practice, I would reply that I do not know, that I cannot tell. The only solid arguments opposing the marriage of the priesthood, that I can find, are the two following—two arguments drawn not from sacred Scripture, nor from right reason, nor from both together, but from Roman carnal polity :

Argument first. The unscriptural and unreasonable custom was brought in as general and indispensable, or made universal and compulsory, by the court of Rome, to bind the clergy to Rome, to unite them with Roman Babylon, by hindering them from having national, local, family ties ; by keeping them aloof, as far as practicable, from the honorable and generous love of family, kindred, home, and country. The Roman court, the heads of the Roman kirk, the pope, cardinals, and the like desired to have one immense clerical tree growing up out of Rome, and extending over Christendom, the trunk being where the Beast is enthroned, and the branches being everywhere ; a tree that may derive sap, nutriment, and firmity directly from the city on seven hills, and spread a dreary shade over all the nations, and wrap the whole world in papal deadly night. The practice was forcibly and cruelly brought about by the Roman court, in order to bind and unite, as it tends to bind and unite all the members of the priesthood in one huge confederation, in one great alliance, one mighty league, in one body wieldy, tractable, governable ; a body separate and apart from the people, unconnected with the laity in affection and interest, unbound and unjoined to

their country by patriotic feeling; unattracted and unsoftened by the dear and tender ties of wife, children, and home; and opposite and hostile to popular right, and the spread and dominion of liberty. (See section 5, subsection 1, article 2.) By the operation of the cruel and barbarian law, the unsocial and unnatural practice, the inhuman and infernal custom, the papal priesthood are scattered throughout the papal world, as a huge, disciplined, active army, not of martyrs, but of masters; not of sin-opposers, but of slave-makers; not to raise people up to heaven, but to crush and trample them down to earth, while their priestly persons walk roughshod over them. The priestal few say to the popular many, "Bow down, that we may go over." Isa. 51:23. Rome is the centre, the strong-hold, the head-quarter of this army militant, not *con* sin, but *con* liberty; from Rome the foul streams of slavery flow, and to Rome the extorted tribute of millions of enslaved people winds a way through a thousand channels. The papal priesthood may not marry, that the Roman court may tyrannize over the nations! and may have fit, able, and willing agents to carry slavery throughout the world! Celibate tends to make the clergy the tyrannical tools of the court of Rome; and the tendency and aptitude of celibate to do so are the leading reason, the main cause why it is upheld. Celibate is a mean to slavery as the end; and it is valued only because it is such a mean. In fine, the reason for having celibate, is to make the priesthood tyrannical tools; and to carry out slavery at large, the desired end; or in other words, is the tendency and aptitude of celibate to do so, its being a desired mean to the desired end.

Argument second. Celibate of the clergy is upheld in order to attract into the coffer of the Roman kirk, of rather clergy, whatever property individual priests may acquire. On the plan of celibate, a priest will probably

leave a part, if not the whole of his real and personal property to the priesthood; whereas, if he were married he would naturally bequeath the property to his wife and children. The pope and priesthood are the heir of the unmarried clergy, therefore the wily court of Rome hinders clerical marriage.

Subsection II. Five other arguments may possibly be given for papally priestal abstaining from marriage; the first derived from Roman priestal vanity, the second drawn from papal phantasy, the third imagined from Paul's authority, the fourth taken from a ground of plausibility, and the fifth obtained from ecclesiastical history.

Argument first. Papal clergymen, taken as men, regarded individually, and viewed apart from their employ and professional character, are too pure, too holy, too angelical a set of beings to meddle with marriage! Heaven help one! What more? So great are the purity, the holiness, the angelicality of the papal priesthood, as to hinder them from marrying! Capital! Who first discovered this wonderful property of the Roman hierarchy, and first employed this cogent and convincing argument, is unknown to me. But peace to his inventive shade! He or she has been canonized of course, or shame to the court and kirk of Rome! What could the Devil's Advocate* find to oppose to the canonization of so notable a character? Surely, surely on the day that saw the personage canonized, or declared to be a saint, the Devil's Advocate and the Devil himself were dumb with admiration, were mute through amazement, were tongue-tied in spite of themselves. But to be serious. Will any one really and coolly bring forward this argu-

* The "*Devil's Advocate*" is an officer of the Roman court whose office it is to rake and collect together all that can be said or charged against one that is about to be made a saint of the papal calendar!

ment, and employ it with a grave countenance? I have doubts on the point. If, however, I were to meet the argument, I would reply somewhat as follows: What hypocrisy! what hyper-hypocrisy! what consummate cant! what laughable humbug! The claim to superior sanctity would be a display of inferior modesty, and would call for indignation, contempt, and pity, from all honest men and women!

Argument second. The priestal confession is too pure, the clerical office too holy, the sacerdotal function too angelical to allow the priesthood to marry. I reply in a twofold way. 1st. Celibate of the clergy is quite opposed to reason and good sense, reason requiring the marriage of a priest, as well as of other men. 2nd. Celibate of the clergy is altogether contrary to the whole current of Holy Scripture, to the palpable meaning of both the Old and the New Testament. This papal doctrine or practice has no authority or warranty in the command and direction given throughout the Bible; and has no sanction, no justification in the practice of patriarch, prophet, apostle, priest, pastor, or other officially or really sacred and holy people. I will bring but two passages, two out of perhap two dozen or even two score. "Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled." Heb. 13: 4. Peter, the favorite of popery, even Peter was married. Matt. 8: 14; 1 Cor. 9: 5. N. B. It is said that all or nearly all the apostles were married. One passage more. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that, in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of demons; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; *forbidding to marry*; and commanding to abstain from meats." 1 Tim. 4. Oh papite! "Read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest this!"

Argument third. The apostle Paul appears, in 1 Cor. 7, to recommend abstaining from marriage, or to prefer

the single life ; and therefore the papal scheme of clerical celibate may boast of scriptural and apostolical authority. Reply 1st. The recommendation or caution was meant to be not perpetual, but temporary ; was given in relation not to time in general, but only to the particular time when the apostle wrote. Paul counselled for the time then present, and for no more. "This is good for the *present* distress." Verse 26. Reply 2d. Paul's words referred not to celibate of mere clergy, but to that of clergy and laity ; not specially or to the few, but generally or to the many or all. Paul here wrote not of the clergy alone, but of the kirk, of christian people generally. "I would that *all* men were even as I." Verse 7. Reader, look the chapter carefully through. It had a reference to times of persecution.

Argument fourth. Celibate gives to the clergy more time for their official duty, by keeping them free from family care. I will give two replies. Reply 1st. If unmarried clergy gain time in one way, they lose time in another, and the loss perhap nearly countervailing the gain. Celibate may gain little even in point of time ; for that the gain as to time is material, is by no mean clear. Reply 2d. But even if the gain in regard to time were great, the loss in regard to other things is greater, the gain in the former line being far inferior to the loss in the latter. Therefore the result on the whole is a preponderating evil. Celibate leads to evils many and great, and therefore does far more harm than good.

Argument fifth. Maybe a papite will argue in the following way : Even if celibate be wrong, even taking for proved that the anti-marriage scheme is unreasonable and unscriptural, and therefore an evil, you protestant ought to blame not the papal kirk, but the pristine, the pristine setting the example, and the papal following it. Even if the pristine kirk did wrong in adopting celibate, the papal did and does right in

having it, copying the pristine pattern. The papal kirk has done well in retaining the custom that it found existing. Whether the early kirk did well, or ill in beginning the custom, the papal did well in continuing it when begun. I will give two replies. Reply 1st. The papal kirk ought to have known that the conduct of the pristine in regard to abstaining from marriage was unreasonable and unscriptural, and therefore ought to have acted in opposition thereto. If the kirk papal would not open its eyes to see the wrong of the kirk pristine, it was very blamable; and if it saw the wrong, and yet made it a part and parcel of its own ecclesiastical economy, it was very blamable. The papal kirk acted badly in following a bad example. Reply 2nd. The papal kirk made what had been frequent and optional, to be universal and compulsory. In the pristine kirk a part of the clergy followed celibate, and did it voluntarily; but in the papal kirk the whole do it, and do it by the hard and stern guiding of compulsion.*

Subsection III. Of course, I write here in opposition to celibacy by compulsion, or of compulsory celibate, or of abstaining from marriage through exterior dictation and control. If the priesthood individually incline to celibate, let them be celibatairs or bachelors; if they voluntarily prefer the single life, let them be free to choose it. If any priest think he has good ground for abstaining from matrimony, let him abstain. Let clergymen have matrimonial freedom, like other men; and in deciding for or against a wife, let them be at liberty to follow their own choice, consulting their conscience,

* The priest has no liberty of conscience in this matter. He has no free volition: he is a perfect slave of the pope and of Satan, who tempts him thence to incontinence. God, and his human constitution, and nature, demand marriage. The pope and the tempter to uncleanness prevail over conscience, and duty, and purity!

using their reason, and examining the word of God.

Subsection IV. While the kirk of Rome has taken care of the Celibate of the clergy, it has left the *Chastity* of the clergy to take care of itself, as a thing of minor note and import. Celibate has been required far more rigorously than chastity. For, while to marry has been strictly prohibited, and severely punished, to be unchaste has been deemed a very venial offence, a mere peccadillo. One might be tempted to imagine the court and kirk of Rome as addressing the priesthood somewhat as follows: "Avoid marriage, for the good of popery, for the good of Rome; indulge more or less in whoredom, for the good of yourselves. Have not a wife, though God allows a wife; repel not a harlot, though God forbids a harlot." In fact, many papal families have preferred a priest who avowedly and regularly kept a concubine, to a priest who did not, they deeming the former paragon of purity less likely to attempt the seduction of their female members.* This fact tells ill for popery, telling more than would a volume. Indeed a dreadful quantum of seduction, fornication, and adultery, is chargeable on the papal priesthood, and is put to their account in the book of God's remembrance. In fine, a great number of the priesthood have greatly neglected the following question of inspired Paul: "Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery?" Rom. 2: 22.

Subsection V. Nepotism, (fondness for *nephews* and *nieces*, or love and care of them,) *nepotism* has been a remarkable quality in popes, cardinals, and other papal clergymen. These *men of God*, though made so by man! have had of course no *son or daughter*; but they have been surrounded with a great number of *nephews*

* In the Catholic Swiss cantons the priests were enjoined to have concubines, to preserve the purity of the wives and daughters of the citizens.

and nieces, for whom they have taken care to provide as other men provide for their own offspring. It is rather strange that brothers and sisters of popes, cardinals, and other clergymen, are so peculiarly productive as very often to have more children than they can rear, educate and settle; and that they find their reverend bachelor brothers so kind to their little ones! What a comfort to them to be fraternally and *sororially** connected with, and to have their young ones snugly settled by pure, holy, evangelical men, who are total strangers to the flesh! entire aliens from carnality! and wholly weaned from sensual predilection! and who love the little creatures with a warmth and a zeal transcendently admirable in uncles who are so wrapped up in spiritual contemplation! so swallowed up and lost in heavenly designing and doing! In kirks where clergymen are allowed to marry, they have children like other men, and have no more than the common number of nephews and nieces, for whom they take no more than common care. In the kirk of Rome, however, where clergymen do not marry, their nephews and nieces are uncommonly and extraordinarily numerous, and are treated by these spiritual and ethereal men with uncommon and extraordinary care and affection. Now how can we account for the notable fact, the zoological phenomenon? May we infer that,—the reverend and sacred men of the papal priesthood having bid farewell to earthly affection, to Cupid and Hymen, and having left population to take care of itself,—nature, fruitful in contriving and providing, has given additional power of procreation to their brothers and sisters, and additional *uncle-love* to themselves, in order that population may suffer no damage, that the burden of supporting a fair

* *Sororial*, meaning sisterly, comes from the Latin *soror*, and is the proper correlative to fraternal, meaning brotherly.

proportion of the young may indirectly and circuitously fall on the shoulders of the reverend men, and that the burden may be borne by them willingly and agreeably? Or, may not we rather infer that the pure personages are apt to go astray, that the clerical celibatairs are prone to be unchaste, that they often leave heavenly and spiritual matters for earthly and fleshly ones, that they frequently abandon the concern of the soul, to mingle with the doing of carnality? If the former inference or theory be the judgment of charity, the latter is the judgment of common reason, of history, and of truth. I end with a query—Did not the word *nepotism* originate in the love and care of nephews and nieces, peculiarly observable in the papal priesthood? Was not the term *nepotism* unknown ere the pope and clergy were surrounded with nephews and nieces, alias, bastard children? Or did the word *nepotism* originate priorly? Had the term been known and employed afore, and therefore was it merely appropriated or peculiarly applied to the conduct of the pope and priesthood of Rome?

Subsection VI. A pope or more, many of the cardinals, and very many of the clergy, while abusing and excommunicating poor Luther and the like, fulminating anathemas and hurling the thunder of the Vatican at the German Reformer and others, truly men of God, for having honorably, virtuously, and scripturally married an honorable, virtuous, and holy woman, have been themselves, in Rome and elsewhere, indulging in unlawful amour and debauchery, lewdly living and reveling with concubines and whores! cursing Luther, and cursed by God! In viewing their intentional barbarity and cruelty, their volitive despotism and oppression, their *willed* persecution, torture, and murder in reference to Luther and the like; in viewing their actual lewd life and sensuality, their seduction, fornication,

and adultery ; in viewing their consummate hypocrisy, their abominable jesuitism, their infamous guile and fraud ; we are powerfully reminded of the words of our Lord, used in relation to members of the Jewish priesthood : " Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell ?" Matt. 23 : 33.

SECTION XVII.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS.

Subsection I. Of Baptism and Eucharist I now affirm nothing. Of the other five, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, I affirm that they are no sacraments at all, that they are utterly without the sacramental character.

1st. *Confirmation.* I do not find the confirmation sacrament in the Bible. Whether or not anything is said there about confirmation as a mere rite or ceremony, (a point whereon I here give no opinion,) I cannot find it there as a sacrament. Where in Holy Writ do we read of the sacrament of confirmation, of being sacramentally confirmed, of a bishop performing a real and proper sacrament by putting his hand on our head, praying for us, and the like ? Nowhere. *Imposition of hands, the laying on of hands*, is mentioned in Scripture ; but nowhere as a sacrament. Whether the ceremony of the *imposition* is taken as not being, or being obligatory on us, and whether it is obligatory little or much, it is not obligatory on account of any sacramental property or character. We Protestants may not all agree about the rite, but we all agree in defying the papal

advocate to prove the sacrament. Moreover, confirmation differs largely from imposition of hands, including it and a very great deal more ; and building the modern papal sacrament of confirmation on the antique and unpretending ceremony, is like building a large and regular mansion on the foundation of a mere small cot. "Oh, but Jesus Christ instituted the sacrament of confirmation!" Did he indeed? When, where and how? The papite will have to bring proof from pretended oral tradition, for he will not find any in the written word, Scripture being silent on the matter. Sacramental confirmation partakes greatly of papally prelatival and of pontifical pride. Thus it appears that confirmation is not a sacrament; that whatever other claim it has, it has not the sacramental one.

2d. *Penance.* Penance is no sacrament. What is penance? Speaking generally, penance is punishment, ecclesiastical punishment. Speaking specially, penance is one of two parts of kirk discipline, either correction or expulsion, and commonly correction. Correction by the kirk is penance; expulsion from the kirk may be penance. (See section 13, subsection 3, article 3.) Correction is multiform, expulsion is uniform; there being a dozen, a score, a hundred kinds of correction, but only one general kind of expulsion. Now is correction taken in general, taken as the genus, a sacrament? or is every species of correction a sacrament? If every species be a sacrament, we shall have not seven sacraments only, but seven score of them. Moreover, is expulsion a sacrament? Calling correction by a kirk, or expulsion from a kirk, a sacrament, is quite nonsensical and ridiculous. If penance be taken to mean penitence, it is no sacrament; being a good thing, but no sacramental one. If penance or penitence be a sacrament, piety and virtue are sacraments. Being penitent is no more sacramental or a sacrament, than

being holy, being moral, and the like are sacramental. Query. What is the symbol, the outward and visible sign in penance? There is none, no symbol or sign. Calling *contrition* or the like the outward sign, terming it, as the council of Trent did, the *quasi materia*, the *matter after a sort, matter as it were*, is mere idle trifling, or mere quibbling, unworthy of a candid man. It follows that penance is not a sacrament.

3d. *Orders*. Whatever else Orders may be, it is not a sacrament. The Roman clergy make a great hubbub and ado about Sacramental Orders or Holy Orders. What is the nature of Orders? for when we know that, we may know that it has little claim or no claim to be deemed sacramental. Several opinions about Orders are abroad in the world; and without attempting to show what is the right one, (an attempt that would be out of place here,) I count to prove that whatever tolerable opinion we adopt, whatever moderate theory we hold, we cannot find the sacrament. One view of Orders is the following: Being Divinely called, being conscientiously called to preach the Gospel; and serving some people in quality of preacher, pastor, minister, &c. with scriptural satisfaction to him and them. To this view or definition, some would add the being called by a presbytery, and others would add the being called or authorized by a bishop. If we take the papal view, the being called or authorized by the pope or a *popeling*, we have four theories on Orders; and maybe four are not all. Now what theory of the whole implies a sacrament? Not one. Where among them all do we find the sacramental? Nowhere. Surely the first-mentioned theory involves no sacrament; and truly there is no sacrament in being called by a presbytery; and the being called or authorized by a bishop is not sacramental. And I would fain know how a sacrament is wrapped up in being called, or authorized, or dubbed

by the pope or a *popeling*. By what rule of reason or Holy Writ is ordination by the bishop of Rome a sacrament more than ordination by the bishop of any other place? By no rule. Ordination from Constantinople or Canterbury, is quite as sacramental as that from Rome, the patriarch and the archbishop being ordainers quite as good as the pope, and mayhap far better. Therefore there is not the sacramental character; or in any moderate meaning of the term, Orders is not a sacrament. Indeed in the full priestly meaning of the term, Orders cannot be proved to be a sacrament without quibbling, and misapplication of language.

Properly and accurately speaking, the sacrament ought to be affirmed not of Orders, but of Ordination, or entering into orders. By Orders I understand the clerical state of life; and by Ordination, I understand entering into that state. Therefore instead of saying the sacrament of orders, papal folk ought to say the sacrament of ordination. What are the several meanings of ordination? I will give four. One meaning is the following: Reception by a man of the spiritual call to preach the Gospel; and agreement between him and some people to minister and to be ministered unto in holy things. This may be called the theory Independent. Next we have the theory Presbyterian, implying, in addition to the above, the call of a presbytery. Then comes the theory Episcopal, a theory upheld by many learned pens, implying the call or authorization of a bishop. Lastly we find the theory Papal, one upheld by the pens and power of Rome, implying the call or authorization of the pope or a *popeling*. Now how, or by what mean can ordination, taken in any meaning of the four, be proved to be a sacrament? Not at all, by no mean. Whatever else it may contain, it contains no sacrament; it may be more simple or more complex, but is not sacramental.

4th. Matrimony. It is quite puerile to call matrimony, or entering into matrimony, a sacrament. Matrimony is a mode of life allowed by Scripture and reason, but has no sacramental character. In this pretended sacrament we find neither the outward and visible sign, nor the inward and spiritual grace ; neither the sign, nor the thing signified. How is grace exhibited, or how is it conferred by marrying ? And where in Scripture do we find the institution of this papal sacrament ? No where. We find it in the unholy council of Trent, but not in the Holy Bible. If people talk at random, they may call not only marriage or marrying, but engaging in our lawful worldly profession a sacrament ; then becoming a merchant, becoming a surgeon, becoming a farmer, are three sacraments.

5th. Extreme Unction. Extreme unction is extreme presumption, but no sacrament. Extreme unction, or anointing people when about to die, and to prepare them for death, is an unscriptural invention, a presumptuous plan of presuming man. Mark and James write of *anointing with oil*. "They anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them. Mark, 6 : 13. Is any sick among you ? Let him call for the elders of the church ; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord : and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." James, 5. Now the anointing here mentioned was in order to recovery, was done that the sick person might live, was done to *heal* the sick, to *save* him and *raise him up*. But the anointing of popery or extreme unction is in order to death, or rather to preparation for death, is done that the sick person may die comfortably, is done (one may fancy) to enable the dying person to glide smoothly out of our world, and to slip swiftly and unobservedly into heaven ! The very name *Extreme Unction* was given to the papal unction, be-

cause it is employed in the extreme moment of life, in the last extremity, when the soul is leaving the body, when death is certain and near at hand. It follows that papal anointing or extreme unction is not in Scripture, and of course is not a sacrament. Moreover, the kind of anointing or unction mentioned in Scripture, is by no mean a sacrament.

Subsection II. In opposition to the notion of seven sacraments, or of any number above two, an argument that I do not remember to have read in any book, or to have heard from any speaker, has occurred to me while writing my work ; and as it appears to me to have considerable weight, it will be given here. It will be stated briefly ; therefore if it shall not please the reader, it will not detain him long.

The inward or spiritual blessings needed by man while on earth, are reducible to two, namely, justification and sanctification, or pardon and purity ; therefore only two outward and visible signs are required, namely, eucharist and baptism, the former signifying justification or pardon, and the latter signifying sanctification or purity. I here take holy joy or love to be implied in sanctification or purity. The things signified being two, the signs need not be seven nor even three, need not be more than two. Can any one prove that our inward or spiritual goods are radically seven or even three, that they are not fairly resolvable into two ? Or can any one prove that either spiritual good requires more than one visible type ? If the goods be but two, and if neither require more than one visible type, two types are enough, and more than two are inutile and unreasonable. There being but two things signified, pardon and purity, let there be but two signs or sacraments, eucharist and baptism. Therefore we want not seven sacraments nor even three, but only two. Two spirituals—two sacraments. If the five pretended papal sacraments mean

not pardon and purity, they are either unmeaning or ill-meaning; if they mean pardon and purity, they are superfluous, eucharist and baptism meaning the same two things. Two spirituals—two sacraments.

Subsection III. Making the foregoing five things appear to the people, and be regarded by them as five sacraments, tends to dignify and magnify the papal priesthood, to increase their pride, to augment and confirm their power, and to indue them with sovereign control. Granting hypothetically that they are sacraments, the priesthood claim to convey greater advantage or good to the people, and appear to stand toward the latter in a more imposing and awful relation. And of course, the papal notion tends to fill the people with vain hope, to make them lean on a broken reed, and to make them think that they have received a spiritual and sacramental blessing, by merely having gone through a pompous ceremonial form. The Roman priesthood may be imagined to address the people somewhat as follows: "If the five things were mere ceremonies or rites, we should convey to you, through them, common and ordinary benefit; but the five being sacraments, we convey to you, by their mediation, benefit uncommon and extraordinary, privileges many and great, blessing and grace sacramental and divine."

1st. If Confirmation be taken for a sacrament, how great are the confirmers! and how greatly exalted is the pride of papal Rome! Whatever else sacramental confirmation does, it confirms the pride and power of the Roman priesthood. Bishops only, I am aware, perform the act of confirmation, or confirm. But other clergymen, as members of the clerical body, partake of the dignity and power that bishops bring to the body; and other clergymen hope to be, in time, exalted to the order prelatial if not pontifical. Therefore the whole Roman priesthood become lifted up and magnified. Moreover,

the priesthood claim to convey greater good to the people confirmed. What the greater good is, I am unable to explain, because unable to conceive. One thing I know: if papists can prove their pretendedly sacramental confirmation to confer more real or solid good than the confessedly ritual one, they will greatly *unconfirm* me in my opposition to Rome.

2nd. If Penance be taken for a sacrament, the priesthood derive the greater importance from being the inflictors. How important the clergy who can measure out sacramental penance to the laity! In knowing when people deserve correction, when they merit expulsion, and when they ought not to suffer either kind of ecclesiastical punishment: in deciding, in reference to correction and expulsion, the following three things, the *fact*, the *guilt*, the *punishment*; in determining if the action really occurred, if it have the character of guilt, and what the punishment ought to be—how intense and how durable:—the Roman priesthood know, decide, and determine in relation to something beyond the common, something bordering on the marvellous, or something above the grasp of our plain protestant wit. They soar far above us, far away into the clouds, the clouds of *mist*; and there they probably discover their penance sacrament, for they cannot find it on solid ground. Otherwise they have a clearer insight into sacramental matters; and, backed by their *infallibility*, their acuteness can penetrate where our obtuseness cannot enter. Comparing the most knowing of the protestant clergy with the most ignorant of the papal, on a point of kirk discipline viewed sacramentally, is like comparing a mole with an eagle,—a papal being the judge! As a result of having and not having the sacramental conceit, the papal clergy become exalted and magnified,—while the protestant clergy are bound to be humble. In punishing a man in the kirk, or in punishing him by

turning him hereout, we indeed see punishment, but we see nothing more, we see not the sacrament; our dim or dull eyes cannot discern the sacramental mystery contained in correction and expulsion: the eagle eye of popery is needed here. Nor have we brain enough to know how a sacrament is wrapped up in penitence, any more than in another moral state of mind. It may be a pity that we are so dim or short-sighted; but to have the perspicacity of Rome, to see a sacrament where none is to be seen, is not within the scope of our will. By our want of it we may lose something, but hardly humility; and by their greater wisdom our papal friends may gain something, and the thing may be pride, or more particularly, the papal priesthood may be rendered proud, overbearingly powerful, presumptuous and the like; and the people be bewildered and befooled, and led to think that they have a substance when they have but the shadow. For on the sacramental plan, how much greater are the blessings (of a spiritual kind I ween) that the clerical imposters of penance convey to the laical sufferers hereof? Indeed the number and magnitude of the benefits accruing to the people from penance laid on them by the priesthood, are quite above my comprehension, and mayhap are equally above that of the poor penance-doing people themselves!

3rd. If orders, or rather ordination, be taken for a sacrament, the papal priesthood are quite at home, are in their own element, and carry the matter with a high hand and an outspread arm. They contend more strongly for the length, and breadth, and depth of the privilege conferred by Ordering or Ordaining—that indescribable something concealed in the sacramental character of Orders. Oh what many great and good things are imparted by sacramental Orders to the happy recipient, to the blissful donee! Here I am lost in an ocean of won-

der! and here the Roman priesthood are directly and immediately, innumerably and immensurably magnified, glorified, and even deified! The blessings and graces of the papal sacrament of Holy Orders or *Unholy Orders*, as the thing may be, are so many and so great as to be incomprehensible and inconceivable by my plain common wit; indeed they are fully numberable and measurable by none but papally priestal penetration. According to the little peep, however, that I, in my humble way, have been able to take into the orders or ordination, mystery or sacrament, I opine, I ween that their ordination conveys to the papal priesthood, or rather that thereby the priesthood convey to themselves, power and authority over the soul, the body, and the estate of the people, the laity; power and authority to send up to heaven all who please, and to send down to hell all who displease them; power and authority to take God's own power out of God's own hands, removing Jesus Christ from the governmental throne of the world, and either sending the Almighty into the idle and *do-nothing* state of an Epicurean god, or confining his rule to Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Halley's Comet, and the like. Maybe, however, God's rule extends as near the earth as the moon; but it comes no nearer. The orbit of the moon may be a kind of boundary line between the pope and the Deity, though the fact is nowhere mentioned by Newton or any other astronomer. I am unable to find any definite and exact boundary between the pope and the devil. Their imperial and sinful majesties are on so intimate and friendly terms, being members of a family alliance, (though not a *holy* one,) as not to require an intermediate boundary; for they rule and govern in a kind of coparcenary way, having all things in common, having no *mine* and *thine*, but only *our*.

4th. If matrimony or marrying be taken for a sacrament, none may contract marriage unless the Roman

or sacramental priesthood perform the solemnization, and procure sacramental support for pride and power; people may not marry, if the priest will not marry them, and do not, by the sacramental whim, endanger his humility and the like. No man may have a wife, and no woman may have a husband afore the priest agrees to tie the matrimonial knot, and risks the untying of his humble demeanor, and letting it run away. Again. No husband or wife may be divorced, unless the priesthood permit, grant a dispensation, or allow a divorce; and unless, through their sacramental hobby, they become in danger of a divorce from more or less of their modest or lowly carriage. Thus people may neither marry nor unmarry without priorly obtaining permission from papal or sacramental Rome, and without giving her occasion for being puffed up by her fancied sacramental importance and power. Moreover, the priesthood claim to convey a greater good or blessing to the married pair, even a sacramental one. If the pretended sacrament would keep away the matrimonial ills that afflict the present life, (through want of piety, good temper, good sense, &c.) it would be a boon; and Rome might then be the general marrier of christendom.

5th. If Extreme Unction be taken for a sacrament, the priesthood obtain the greater regard by being the anointers. How important the priestly hand that *sacramentally* anoints the dying person! Moreover, they claim to convey far superior advantage to the dying man or woman's body or soul, to the latter I opine. What the boon and benefit are that the clerical donor confers on the laical donee, I do not pretend to imagine. Maybe Extreme Unction is sometime given not only as a viaticum, a provision for the journey, but even as a kind of letter of recommendation to Peter! a kind of passport to heaven!

Subsection IV. The tendency and aptitude of the papal doctrine of the five sacraments to promote priest rule, to bring power, and pelf, and exaltation to the papal priesthood, are the grand recommendation of the doctrine to their priestly favor, are the leading reason, the main cause why the doctrine was imposed upon the world, or why it was palmed on the unreading, unthinking, confiding multitude. The people depended on the priesthood to be guided in the true scriptural way; and the latter, deeming the fivefold sacramental doctrine a utile medium for promoting their own temporal interest, beguiled the poor people by the delusive quintuple medley of reality and fable. The five sacraments are five particular plans for pillaring up the priesthood, and for confirming their power and rule; and thereby form the principal ground for the papal sacramental doctrine. Revelation and reason afford no good ground for the doctrine, therefore the priesthood uphold it because of its priestrutive character. The doctrine favors the Roman clergy; and for this reason, and for no other, it is favored by them in return. If the five sacraments were not five strong supporters of priestrule, they might go to the four winds. Alas! How many of the doctrines of popery have no foundation in truth! *Popery is a cunning compound of superficial truth and solid error.*

Subsection V. Article 1. Papal folk have held an impious and immoral dogma, in holding that the sacraments confer grace independently on the state of the mind, on the bent of the will, on the secret intention of the soul; that they confer grace *ex opere operato, through work wrought*.* The notion of the inherent efficacy of the bare sacramental rite is a dangerous delusion. Holding the opinion that the mere

* Query. Are the three Latin words, *ex opere operato*, duly rendered by the three English ones, *through work wrought*?

regular performing. of the sacramental rite, the mere *opus operatum* or work wrought, confers grace or makes one a christian, will naturally take off the attention from the great essentials of repentance and faith, pardon and purity. The delusive opinion will greatly tend to substitute the sign for the thing signified, will more or less make christianity appear to consist in name instead of in nature, and will effectively bring one to pay more regard to the outward ceremony, than to inward devotion or holiness of heart. The delusive opinion leads one to contravene the benevolent design of heaven, counteracting the love and goodness of God.

Article 2. Popery has taught the delusive and dangerous doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. Baptismal Regeneration may mean two things. 1st. It may mean that baptism is regeneration, that baptism by water is regeneration by the Spirit, that the material and outward ceremony is the only mental and inward change, that there are not a sign and a thing signified, or that the sign and the thing signified are identical, or that the mere bodily and external washing is all in all. 2nd. It may mean that baptism is always accompanied by regeneration, that baptism by water is ever connected with regeneration by the Spirit, that the material and outward ceremony is invariably attended by the mental and inward change, that the sign has a constant companion in the thing signified, or that the bodily and external washing and the spiritual and internal blessing, the two parts of the whole, inseparably go hand in hand, the application of less or more of water to the body being never without the application of purity or sanctification to the soul. Now the foregoing two meanings are unreasonable and unscriptural, and particularly the former meaning. Baptism is not regeneration. Baptism is not always accompanied by regeneration. The water ceremony neither is, nor is continually followed by,

the renewal of heart or purification of soul. The first meaning is uncommonly absurd, and the second absurd enough. Baptism may be, and sometime is an operative mean of grace, and accompanied by regeneration. It may be a leading mean of grace, one of the most important of all; and may be not seldom attended by the regenerating operation. But that baptism is universally an effective mean of grace, and universally attended by regeneration or renovation, is denied or contradicted by all we see, and hear, and read; by the testimony of every country and age, or by the general experience of the christian world. Affirming baptism either to be regeneration, or to be always accompanied by it, is a part of the *ex opere operato* plan, that monster of popery and murderer of piety. And the affirmation has been made over and over by the papal tongue and pen. Papal priests of pagan principle, gravely tell the people that when baptized they are *born again*! when sprinkled with water, or immersed herein, they are *made new creatures*! What heathen darkness relating to the work of God upon the soul, to the words of Holy Scripture, and to right reason! I pity the blind guides, and the poor souls whom they guide, or rather *misguide*. "Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" John, 3. Unrenewed, unholy, unregenerate men advocate baptismal regeneration. But do we find people truly converted to God, people of real religion, of genuine godliness, of decided and deep personal piety; do we find them contending for the doctrine? Very seldom indeed. They who are regenerated by the Holy Ghost, who are renewed in the image of Christ, who are scripturally and spiritually born again, who are sanctified by Divine power, who are really and truly changed in heart from sin to holiness, they hurl to the winds, or even to the fiends, the solemn foolery, the monster doctrine, the dangerous delusion, the pestilent principle, the fatal

error, the baneful heresy of baptismal regeneration,—that lamentable offspring of papal Rome. N. B. Of course, these remarks on baptismal regeneration apply to it when taken in the meanings here given, and then only. Therefore if any one take baptismal regeneration in a third meaning, in one quite different from the foregoing two, he is not affected by these remarks, and has no reason to feel offended or hurt.

I see no more reason for holding baptismal regeneration, than for holding eucharistal forgiveness of sin; baptismal sanctification and eucharistal justification being doctrines equally tenable, or rather equally untenable. Now no reasonable, scriptural, and holy men really believe, or ought really to believe in eucharistal justification; therefore none ought to believe in baptismal sanctification. The eucharist, or Lord's Supper, is an outward sign of justification, and Baptism is an outward sign of sanctification; but the two signs are not the two things signified, and are not always accompanied by them. As people can, and often do receive the eucharist without being justified; so people can and often do, receive baptism without being sanctified. In fine, eucharistal pardon and baptismal regeneration are two doctrines equally and eminently unchristian and absurd.

Baptismal regeneration must surely imply *baptismal forgiveness of sin*; justification being clearly implied by sanctification. Whoever has purity, has pardon; whoever is freed from the corruption of his heart, is liberated from his guilt in the court of heaven. God does not cleanse a soul from inward pollution, without remitting the debt contracted by iniquity. Will God renew a man in his own holy image, while he is under the curse, and exposed to the vengeance of the broken law? will God make him fit for heaven, while he is liable to the punishment of hell? the heart of an angel being joined to the doom of a devil? No, no. A sanctified

soul is a justified one, heaven-born holiness is meant to lead to heavenly happiness, a god-like soul is not appointed to be eternally absent from God, and sanctification, the farther and higher work, is not without justification, the preliminary one. As the Lord does not mean to damn a being having his own pure nature, so he pardons if he purify. Sanctification implying justification; if water baptism imply the former, it implies the latter; if through being outwardly baptized we be regenerated, through that we are forgiven; and therefore baptismal regeneration implies baptismal forgiveness of sin. Now as reasonable, scriptural, and holy people do not hold baptismal forgiveness of sin, do not believe that water baptism must imply or carry justification; so they ought not to hold or believe, but ought to reject the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, or of sanctification being conveyed by a mere rite, hurling the nonsensical notion to all the winds that blow

SECTION XVIII

PRIESTAL INTENTION.

Subsection I. Think of the blasphemous conceit of Priestal Intention. We have been told, in effect, that people, whatever the state of their heart, whatever the bent of their soul, however good, do or do not receive benefit in religious ordinance, particularly the seven sacraments, according to the secret intention of the officiating priest! Without intention in the priest, there is no real sacrament! If the priest intend to bless, they are blessed! if the priest intend not to bless, they are not blessed! It follows that the priest, and not God

only, is the blesser! that the priest, and not God only, gives or withholds the blessing! Detestable compound of falsehood, pride, and blasphemy! abhorrible* engine of popery and Rome!

The plain and palpable aim or object of the utterly unreasonable and unscriptural doctrine of priestly intention, is to magnify the power of the priesthood over the people, to make the latter tremble before the former, and fear to offend them, lest they occasion the withholding of priestly intention! Priestal intention is maintained to maintain priestal interest.

Subsection II. Article I. The doctrine of priestal intention, however, is a two-edged sword, and a two-pointed one, and deservedly cuts and pierces the unworthy priestly hand that wields it. According to the doctrine, nobody on earth can be certain or can have certain knowledge that a supposed priest is a real one; that he was really ordained, really confirmed, or really baptized; that his ordination, confirmation, or baptism was any thing more than a mere empty form or unreal mockery. How can any one know it certainly, seeing that the validity of the ordination, confirmation, baptism, depends on the intention of another, and that no one can certainly and fully know another man's intention? Who upon earth can search the heart, see the interior of the soul, or evidently know the secret thought and intention of the mind of another, of priest A or priest B? No one. Therefore no one upon earth can indubitably know that a priest when baptizing, confirming, ordaining, or administering the eucharist, penance, marriage, or extreme unction, really intends to baptize, confirm, ordain, or the like. For aught that any man or woman can assuredly tell, the priest does not so intend, has not the required intention, and therefore hinders the

* Is not the word *abhorrible* a very proper one.

being of a real and true sacrament. In regard to any sacrament of the seven, if the priest do not intend to make the sacrament, no sacrament is made; and we cannot affirm with clear knowledge, that he does intend to make it. We are not sure that, in administering a sacrament, a priest has the due intention; and perhaps he has it not. We know not that he has, and perhaps he has not. If a priest intend not to baptize, confirm, ordain, or the like, there is no baptism, confirmation, ordination, or the like; and probably many a priest have, one time or oftener, been without the due intention; and therefore probably many a sacrament have been unreal and null, or a mere hollow mockery. And when we contemplate the long line of priests, a line reaching from the christian era to our day, we find that hundreds or thousands of men may have wanted the right intention; and therefore may have, hundreds or thousands of times, nullified or hindered a sacrament, or wholly corrupted a sacramental administration; and therefore may have, hundreds or thousands of times, brought disorder and nullity into the kirk, unpriesting the priesthood, and unchristianizing both priesthood and people. The great priestal chain extending from the apostolic time to our time, contains thousands of links; and any priestal link may have failed in right intention, and so may have destroyed or prevented a sacrament, and so may have let confusion and nihility into the long and broad range of ecclesiastical conduct and character, making a thing to be nothing, and men to be not what they appear. In fine, according to the doctrine of priestal intention, apparent priests may be not really priestal, and apparent christians may be not really christian—sacramentally. See Transubstantiation, subsection 2, argument 18.

Article 2. I quote the following from *Gideon Ouseley*: "While the clergy contemplated the great benefits which accrued to them from this doctrine of intention,

even the full subjugation of the people, and were comforted with the delightful prospect, through the blindness of their hearts to which it seems God gave them up in just judgment for their daring conduct and Babel building, little did they think or foresee they were preparing a rod terribly to scourge themselves, a complete instrument of their own undoing. For while this doctrine exalts them thus to the summit of their desires, it is but for a moment, and to precipitate them headlong into utter annihilation. For if by the want of intention in them when they ministered, the people were destroyed; so by the want of the like intention in those who baptized and ordained themselves, must themselves be destroyed. So that now, if they have not been rightly baptised and ordained by such as were rightly qualified, and had right intention, and they again by other such persons, and so on back to the very apostles—a thing impossible, they have no true baptism or ordination at all; and this operating on the whole body of the clergy, necessarily exterminates them all. For if by this doctrine of intention, all the people of the papal church are brought unto such miserable circumstances and perplexities, that 'tis impossible for them to know whether their clergymen be lawful, or be christians at all; or whether they be christians themselves, or have received any true sacrament; (as *Bellarmino* confesses) or whether what they have and do receive, being false sacraments, are not hastening their damnation! so also are the priests, from the highest to the lowest of them, unavoidably plunged into the same abyss of uncertainty and misery; because 'tis impossible for them to know whether they be priests, as above noticed, and as *Gabriel Biel* (one of them) is obliged to allow; or whether all their services be not so many sacrileges, hastening their own destruction, and that of their people! Thus by this famous canon of Intention, found in the Council of

Florence, and in that of Trent, by this conspicuous child of the Infallibility, is the entire Papal Church, Clergy, People, Infallibility, Transubstantiation, with all the other peculiarities, grandeur, and high pretensions of the papacy, precipitated into eternal ruin—swallowed up as in a moment—and devoured altogether!! Thus corruption terminates in its own ruin.

"Saith *Gabriel Biel*, 'No priest that celebrateth, can know evidently whether he be a priest; for he cannot know evidently whether he be baptized, or whether he be lawfully ordained.'

"Saith cardinal *Bellarmino*, 'No man can be certain, with the certainty of faith, that he receives a true sacrament; because it depends on the intention of the minister, and none can see another man's intention.'"

SECTION XIX.

SUPERSTITION.

Subsection I. Superstition is one main essential of popery, being thoroughly and largely mingled with the other materials of the papal fabric. Standing up for trifles; making a great stir about little things; treating a duck as if it were a swan, and a hawk as if it were an eagle; carefully regarding the minor matter, and often disregarding the major one;—this conduct imbues the whole papal system; runs through the length, the breadth, and the depth hereof; is found in every grade, even from the pope to the lowest friar; and appears in all work, from the canonization of a worthy, or *the making and marring of a new Jesus Christ*, (see Tran-

substantiation,) to the counting of the beads, or the placing of an image. To one deeply imbued with the sublime spirit of Scripture, and filled with the soul of ennobling philosophy, a great portion of the papal scheme appears little more than a mere mass of mummery; an innumerable number of nothings; the mountain deemed a molehill, and the molehill esteemed a mountain; the lion bartered for the jackal, and the jackal exchanged for the mouse.

White, black, and gray, with all their trumpery.

, MILTON.

And how could it easily be otherwise? Popery is designed not for the mind, the soul, the reason, but for the body, the senses, the ear and the eye; is intended to prepare man not for communion with God, but for subjection to the priesthood; is meant not to elevate human beings in the scale of existence, and to endow them with heaven, but to keep or make them unintellectual and low, and even to deprive them of earth. Popery was planned to promote spiritual and temporal slavery; to make the many (the people) a mere beast of burden, and to make the few (the priesthood) the burdener, rider, and owner. Therefore popery is in a manner bound to deal in littles, to occupy and amuse mankind with trifling and toys, and to allure and delude the world with hollow appearances and with empty show. Of a large part of popery, one may say *cui bono?* to what good? what good and solid end does it accomplish? Alas! It is marked with vanity; it is followed by inutility; it is plagued with barren toil, with unprofitable care, with laborious attention to petty points that bring no reward. "Wo unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith. Matt. 23:23

Luke, 11:42. Ye blind guides, who strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel." Matt. 23:24.

Subsection II. I remember having attended, many years ago, and on Europe continental, the public Sunday service of a popish cathedral. What did I find there? A round of silly trifling, a tedious and tiresome course of mere fiddle-faddle, an interminable succession of nothings, of tweedledum and tweedledee. The ringing of bells, the lighting of tapers, the burning of incense, the sprinkling of water, the changing of apparel, the gabbling of priests, the comical contortion of the face, the ridiculous attitudes of the body, the turning and twisting, the innumerable number of ceremonies and empty forms, surfeited and sickened me, not with religion certainly, but with popery and irreligious man. I beheld a host of clergymen; and they, with the unmeaning frivolities wherein they were occupied, appeared to have little more to do with real religion, with personal piety, with heart-work, than a number of boys unconcernedly gabbling over a catechism. The ear and the eye had something to please and allure them; but the mind was left empty, and the soul unsatisfied. I heard good music, I saw good pictures; but I met little rationality, and little or less religion. I was strongly reminded, by contrast, of that fine passage of our Redeeming Lord: "God is a Spirit; and they who worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth." John, 4:24. I observed in the papal display nothing of spiritual and true worship; nothing to fill the deep desire, to answer to the inward longing, to respond to the intellectual aspiration of an immortal mind, of a soul created by God, to live for and with God, through all eternity. If man had no soul, and no immortality, the papal exhibition would be all very well. I can easily imagine a sensible Hindoo, after hearing and seeing what I heard and saw, making the following soliloquy: "I have met foolery at

home, and I meet foolery here ; and I deem our pagan foolery about equal to your papal one." My own soliloquy, on leaving the cathedral, was the following : " Vanity of vanities, vanity of vanities ; all is vanity." Eccles. 1 : 2.

Subsection III. What a multitude of things, rites, customs, and laws, forming a huge bulk of trifling ceremonial and idle externality, doing no good and great harm, has popery borrowed or invented, and daringly added to the pure and simple scheme of the Lord ! I will mention a part only, and in a very general manner ; for to mention the whole, and with full particularity, would require a volume. We find holy water, holy salt, holy clay, holy bones, holy grains, holy beads, holy scapulars, holy ashes, holy candles, and the like. We find the baptizing of bells, the lighting of lamps or candles by day, the burning of incense, and the like. We find pilgrimages, festivals, fasts, prohibition of meats, bodily suffering, and other matters of like kind. What a pile of folly and profanity !*

Did popery find the foregoing things ready made, or did she make them ? She found a great number ready made by the paganism of antiquity ; for we have to remember that many or most of the ceremonies and customs whereby the papal kirk differs from the protestant, are of heathen origin. Indeed, a deal of popery is mere paganism under the borrowed and honorable name of christianity. Popery and paganism ! Alas ! Why has the mantle of departed pagan error been taken up and worn by any system bearing the christian name, and claiming to have come from the word of truth !

Pye Smith has the following two periods : " A prostrate obedience to these usurpations is produced and

* A brief and useful account of papal superstitions may be found in Ingram Cobbin's " Book of Popery."

maintained by terrifying the consciences of the wretched votaries of this superstition with the threats of unavoidable and eternal damnation.—Can any language do justice to the unprincipled fraud and impudence, the blaspheming impiety, of this vile delusion ?”*

Subsection IV. Relics. Any thing or every thing appears to be a relic, that enables a priest while pretending to benefit the people, really to bamboozle them, and obtain possession of their money. No matter what the relic is, or of whom or of what it is a relic. Bone, teeth, nail, hair, tusk, horn, hoof, and claw ; a preserved ear, a pickled tongue, and a candied nose ; the remain of a great toe, of a little toe, and of no toe at all. The relic may be something of an apostle, or an apostate ; of a saint, or a sinner ; of a christian martyr, or a gypsy fortune-teller ; of an orang-outang from the Indies, or a Barbary ape ; of a living lion, or a dead ass ; of the great fish that swallowed Jonah more than two thousand years ago, or a pilchard caught in Cornwall last year, and eaten in Rome in the present Lent of 1839. All are fish that come to the papal net, all are relics that promote gainful jugglery.

I have somewhere seen or heard an anecdote on the point that I will mention, so well as I recollect, for the instruction of the reader. A priest sold to different people what he called a leg of the ass that carried our Lord into Jerusalem. In the overflowing of his zeal, however, for their spiritual welfare, or for his own pecuniary profit, he sold a leg to five people ! These people happening to be severally aware of the whole circumstance, the fivefold purchase, and wondering at the marvellous matter, called on the priest together to have the mystery explained. His reverence seeing the predicament he was in, (for the five buyers, with open

* See “ The Reasons of the Protestant Religion,” page 37.

mouth, were before him,) put a solemn face on the affair, and gravely assured them that the said ass was an extraordinary one, even more so than Balaam's, and had, in addition to other wonderful properties, the miraculous merit of having *five legs*! Maybe if all the legs of our Saviour's ass that have been sold were known and brought together, they would amount not to five merely, but to five score, or even five hundred!

Possibly as many finger and toe-nails of the apostle Peter only, have been sold, as would nail all the fingers and toes of a corner of Christendom!

As to locks of the Virgin Mary's hair, I am lost in amazement at their possible number. If Mary's hair were about as plentiful as the widow's meal and oil mentioned in 1 Kings 17, it would be little enough possibly for all the locks said to be taken therefrom. Am I not pretty near the truth in the following couplet?

More locks of the Virgin's hair have been,
Than single hairs on her head were seen.

Subsection V. Pious fraud is a common proverb. Pious however is too good a word to be desecrated by connection with so bad a word as fraud. Moreover, the word pious is not adequately definite and exact in meaning. I exchange pious for *priestal*. *Priestal fraud*. And alas! if all priestal frauds that have occurred since the world began, or even since popery began, were assembled together in one place, and formed into one mass, they would constitute a huge heap, a prodigious pile, a colossal monument, beside which the tower of Babel would appear as the tower of a common country church! the largest Egyptian pyramid would resemble a sugar-loaf! and a mountain would be like a molehill! Happily priestal fraud, though very far from obsolete, is obsolescent. I conclude the paragraph by quoting sub-

stantially a saying of that unholy and immoral *popan* infidel (some call him an *atheist*) pope Leo the tenth. "What an inexhaustible mine of wealth do we find the fable concerning Jesus Christ!"

Subsection VI. I may take the opportunity of mentioning that I have somewhere read or heard of three theories propounded by some papal oracular men, to account for the birth of Luther. 1st. That he sprang from a she-devil and a wizard! 2d. That he sprang from a he-devil and a witch! 3d. That he sprang from a he-devil and a she-one! Another possible theory, that he sprang from a wizard and a witch, would not, I suppose, be bad enough to account for the birth of the German worthy, the sun of the Reformation.

SECTION XX.

BLASPHEMY.

Subsection I. Superstition abounding in the practice, Blasphemy abounds in the doctrine of the kirk of Rome, as we shall find by going through the doctrines one by one.

1st. Is not the assumption of Infallibility an example of blasphemy? Short-sighted, ignorant, and erring man can hardly declare himself infallible, without blaspheming; for he thereby attributes to himself the prerogative of God. "Now we see through a glass, darkly; * * * Now I know in part." 1 Cor. 13: 12.

2nd. What is the attribution of Divine authority to the Vulgate, Apocrypha, and Tradition, but blasphemy? Putting a mere human translation or the Vulgate, put-

ting a mere human original or the Apocryphal collection, putting mere Traditional trumpery—on an equality with the inspired word of God, is really blaspheming; for it is making human wisdom or human folly equal to the wisdom of Jehovah. "Add thou not unto God's words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. 30 : 6.

3rd. Forbidding people to read the Bible, while God bids them to read it, implies a kind of blasphemy. "Search the Scriptures." John, 5 : 39. "*Turn away from these poisonous pastures.*"—*Bull of Leo XII.* (See page 127.) "Blessed is he that readeth," &c. Rev. 1 : 3. "*If any presume to read * * * he shall not have absolution,*" * * *—*Council of Trent.* (See page 121.)

4th. Using an Unknown Tongue, in order to keep the people ignorant of God's word, and of their duty toward him, and in order to make the priesthood appear so many little gods, involves a kind of blasphemy, or a thing about as bad. "Write the vision, and make it plain." Hab. 2 : 2. The pope and priesthood, by concealing it in an unknown tongue, make it obscure and perplexing.

5th. Is there no blasphemy in Transubstantiation? We cannot pretend to make a Jesus Christ, and then to destroy, to eat and drink him, without blaspheming!

6th. The Sacrifice of the Mass is declared, in the 31st Article of the kirk of England, to be a "blasphemous fable."

7th. Is no blasphemy implied in the worship of the host?

8th. Half Communion implies very daring presumption, if not blasphemy, in overturning and putting aside the undoubted and allowed institution of our Lord.

9th. Committing Idolatry, putting many a saint and angel nearly on a par with God, or with Christ the Mediator, is blaspheming.

10th. The papal doctrine of Merit, of Works of Supererogation, by making the Creator a debtor to the creature, involves blasphemy. "When ye shall have done all those things that are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do." Luke, 17: 10.

11th. Asserting the fable of Purgatory, with praying God to deliver herefrom, is mocking our Maker, and therefore is very like blaspheming.

12th. The doctrine of priestal absolution and excommunication contains a large amount of blasphemy, by proudly claiming for men the prerogative of God! "Who can forgive sins, but God only? Mark, 2: 7. * * He only is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matt. 10: 28.

13th. Auricular Confession involves a degree of blasphemy, in pretending that none can be saved without confessing to a priest, and in private, and thereby making the priest a kind of *co-saviour*. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Acts, 16: 31.

14th. Is there nothing like blasphemy in telling a large body of men, the clergy, that they may not marry, while God tells them that they may? If any deny it to be blaspheming, can they deny it to be contradicting God? "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, * * * *Forbidding to marry*. 1 Tim. 4: 1-3.

15th. Is there nothing like blasphemy in pretending that Christ ordained seven sacraments, though he ordained no more than two? and in making the human five and the Divine two to be co-equals? Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction are the mere coinage of Rome, having no sacramental character in the written word of God: yet popery has proudly put the vain and complex inventions of men on a

par with the strikingly significant and beautifully simple institutions of our Lord.

16th. Priestal Intention has a great deal of blasphemy, in affirming a sacrament to be or not to be, in pretending that people obtain spiritual blessing or obtain it not, according to the secret intention of the officiating priest! The doctrine makes the priest a partner with God in the work of saving a soul! It even puts the gracious working of the Deity himself under the official control of thousands of his creatures! making the Holy Ghost dependant on a priest!

In relation, however, to the sixteen parts or heads, the reader can prosecute the train of thought by himself; and therefore I leave him to enlarge the inquiry according to his own free judgment.

Subsection II. Additional blasphemy. Firstly. Who are not amazed at the blasphemous titles that have been given to, and taken by the papal chief? "*The Lord God the Pope!*" "*Our Lord God the Pope!*" "*Another God upon earth!*" "*True God, and true man?*" "*King of kings, and Lord of lords!*" "*Lord of the Universe!*" "*The Light that came into the world!*" "*The Universal Head!*" "*The Universal Bishop!*" "*The Husband of the Church!*" and the like. The last title scripturally belongs to Christ. Rev. 19:7, and 21:9, See Isa. 54:5. The title "King of kings, and Lord of lords," is thrice given to Christ. 1 Tim. 6:15, Rev. 19:16, and 17:14. Moreover, Christ is called "the prince of the kings of the earth." Rev. 1:5. Moreover, see Deut. 10:17, and Dan. 2:47. It appears that pope Paul the fifth called himself *Vice-God, the monarch of christendom, the supporter of papal omnipotence, &c. &c.* Papal blasphemers, examine yourselves. Miserable men! deceiving and deceived!

Secondly. The pope daringly pretends to have the keys of earth, of hell, and heaven! He assumes au-

thority to do what he will on earth, to send whom he will to hell, and to send whom he will to heaven! Proud and blasphemous worm! Who would imagine that so great presumption and blasphemy dwell in a weak and mortal man!

The pope pretends to have the keys
Of earth, and hell, and heaven!
Affirms that power over these
To him is amply given!
Power to rule, to damn, to save!
Three worlds being subject to one knave!
Oh pope! if ever blasphemy
Were found in man, 'tis found in thee.

Subsection III. "He shall speak great words against the Most High. Dan. 7: 25. The man of sin, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped: so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. 2 Thess. 2. I saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of *blasphemy*. He opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name. Rev. 13: 1, 6. I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of *blasphemy*, having seven heads and ten horns." Rev. 17: 3. See chapter first, section ninth or last.

SECTION XXI.

POPERY IS A NOVELTY.

"Where was your religion before Luther?" This showy and shallow question has been often put. "Where

was your religion before Luther?" said a Jesuit to a British Protestant. The latter replied, "Where your religion never was, in the written word of God." They ask, "Where was your religion before Luther?" We ask them, "Where was your religion before the Council of Trent?" Did not that Council and Pope Pius IV make several new articles of faith? They did. And what is called the creed of Pope Pius fourth contains *twelve* articles more than the Nicene or Constantinoplan creed, *twelve new articles!* Surely the twelve new articles were not a part of the old faith; for if they were they would form a part of the old creed. To show more fully, however, that popery is a novel or new think, I will now go on to prove, by a short historical account, that popery has gradually arisen or grown up since the primitive and pure time of christianity, not only since the reign of Constantine, but even in time comparatively modern. "Where was your religion afore the Council of Trent?"

1st. Infallibility was not claimed till many centuries after Christ. It is hard to mark the exact time when it began; but if we may date it from the leading event whereby it was helped forward, or from the most remarkable move in its early career, we may deem it to have begun in the seventh century, in A. D. 606. In that woful year the pope gained the title of *Universal Bishop*. But though infallibility may be viewed as then born, it took centuries in growing up to full size and complete strength, or to its ultimate maturity.

2d. Vulgate, Apocrypha, Tradition. Their sacred or canonical character was laid down and made an article of faith by the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century.

3d. Knowledge a proscribed thing, and the Bible a forbidden book. The proscription and forbidding began nearly imperceptibly, went on by little and little, and

became in time remarkable in extent and formidable in power ; and if admitting a more exact or formal date in their very early career, may probably be dated from the secularizing of the kirk in the fourth century. The seed was then sown, if it did not then sprout.

4th. Unknown Tongue, or Latin the general language of popery. This *great improvement* on the Divine plan was made or brought in by pope Vitalian in century seventh, in A. D. 666.

5th. Transubstantiation was begun by second Nicene Council in century eighth, and was made an article of faith by the fourth Lateran Council in century thirteenth.

6th. The Sacrifice of the Mass could not be afore transubstantiation.

7th. The Worship of the Host could not be afore transubstantiation.

8th. Half Communion, or No Cup to the Laity. It began in century eleventh, and was fully and finally settled by the Council of Constance in century fifteenth.

9th. Idolatry appears to have begun, openly and effectively, in century fourth, and was confirmed by the second Nicene Council in century eighth.

10th. Merit, according to the papal view of the thing, may be dated from the twelfth century, for then the monster whim of Supererogation was first invented, the invention being made at the end of the twelfth century.

11th. Purgatory, and Praying for the Dead. According to the learned *Hartwell Horne's Protestant Memorial*, Purgatory was not introduced until the time of Gregory, in the beginning of century seventh ; was not positively affirmed till about the year 1140, the middle of century twelfth ; and was not made an article of faith till made one by the Council of Trent in century sixteenth.

12th. Priestal Absolution and Excommunication, as a formal and definite twofold thing, may probably be dated from twelfth century, for then Indulgence became a part of the papal heresy. *H. Horne's Prot. Memorial* declares,—“It is a fact well attested in ecclesiastical history, that the power of granting indulgences was not claimed by the popes before the twelfth century.”

13th. Auricular Confession was first enjoined by fourth Lateran Council in century thirteenth.

14th. Celibate of the Clergy in whole and by law, or universal and compulsory, was begun by pope Cyricius, or Siricius, in the end of century fourth, and was completely confirmed by pope Gregory VII in the end of century eleventh.

15th. The Seven Sacraments. That the sacraments are exactly seven, was first formally maintained by Peter Lombard in century twelfth; and that they are exactly seven, was first made a matter of faith by the Council of Trent in century sixteenth.

16th. Priestal Intention was formally and fully set up by the Council of Florence in century fifteenth.

17th. Superstition began early, though probably it received a grand impetus, and therefore may have the date from the secularizing of the kirk, in century fourth; and it became fully confirmed by the *papalizing* of the kirk in century seventh, when the pope presumed to be the general ecclesiastical head under the title of *Universal Bishop*: for it made a main move from each great event, the christian kirk becoming thenceforth deformed and corrupted by her unhallowed union with pagan superstitions.

18th. Blasphemy, bold and open blasphemy, may be dated from century seventh, A. D. 606, when the pope became entitled the *Universal Bishop*, a vain, arrogant, and blasphemous title! N. B. The patriarch of Constantinople indeed had priorly obtained the title of

Universal Bishop, but he held it only a very short time. As a standing or permanent thing, the title began with the pope of Rome ; and therefore from his obtaining of the title we may date the blasphemy.

Reader, we have now gone through the special order, the eighteen parts or heads whereinto popery is here divided and what have we found ? We have found that they are not old, but new ; that they have not antiquity, but *modernity*.* The eighteen things were not from the beginning of christianity ; therefore they are not christian. In fine, Popery is a *Novelty*, an *Innovation*, an *Addition to Christianity*, an imperfection and corruption added by man to the pure and perfect Revelation of God. *Popery is a Novelty*.†

* I beg leave to coin the word *modernity* to mean time modern, as antiquity means time ancient or antique.

† I now refer the reader to the chronological map at the beginning of the book, and beg him to review it with care, it being a summary peculiarly planned and carefully made, of the present section. Though I have seen no former map of the kind, and therefore have no sanction for mine by example, yet I hesitate not to put it forth, deeming the history of popery brought within the limit of a glance of the eye, to be very helpful to the memory, and very convenient.

FINIS.

x



X

